



Calhoun: The NPS Institutional Archive
DSpace Repository

Theses and Dissertations

1. Thesis and Dissertation Collection, all items

2005-09

Japanese-U.S. missile defense stepping stone towards normalization

Oberle, John P.

Monterey California. Naval Postgraduate School

<http://hdl.handle.net/10945/2050>

Downloaded from NPS Archive: Calhoun



Calhoun is the Naval Postgraduate School's public access digital repository for research materials and institutional publications created by the NPS community. Calhoun is named for Professor of Mathematics Guy K. Calhoun, NPS's first appointed -- and published -- scholarly author.

Dudley Knox Library / Naval Postgraduate School
411 Dyer Road / 1 University Circle
Monterey, California USA 93943

<http://www.nps.edu/library>



NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

THESIS

**JAPANESE – U.S. MISSILE DEFENSE: STEPPING STONE
TOWARDS NORMALIZATION**

by

John P. Oberle

September 2005

Thesis Advisor:

Edward A. Olsen

Thesis Co-Advisor:

H. Lyman Miller

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			<i>Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188</i>	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)		2. REPORT DATE September 2005	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE: Japanese – U.S. Missile Defense: Stepping Stone Towards Normalization			5. FUNDING NUMBERS	
6. AUTHOR(S)				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000			8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) N/A			10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER	
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) <p>The United States-Japanese missile defense cooperation signals yet another step in Japan's continuing trend of "normalization" and official acknowledgement that Japan has a significant military force. This thesis analyzes the current status of the Japanese missile defense debate and assesses factors shaping the Japanese commitment to joint missile defense with the United States. Three major inter-related trends mark the course of Japanese post-Cold War SDF evolution, relations with the United States and the missile defense debate. These include a willingness to relax legal considerations on the use of military force, the expansion of the roles for the JSDF, and the responsiveness of Japanese decision makers to external factors, notably the requirement to improve relations with the United States and the threat perceived from North Korea. This represents a shift to a more military-based security outlook away from the traditional notion of "comprehensive security." These trends point invariably to the amendment of Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution. To maximize U.S. interests, Washington must pursue a balanced and limited missile defense in East Asia and actively undertake measures to avoid the perception of a threat to Chinese nuclear deterrence.</p>				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Ballistic Missile Defense, Ballistic Missiles, East Asia, Japan-U.S. Relations, Northeast Asia			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 115	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 2-89)
Prescribed by ANSI Std. Z39-18

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited

**JAPANESE – U.S. MISSILE DEFENSE: STEPPING STONE TOWARDS
NORMALIZATION**

John P. Oberle
2nd Lieutenant, United States Air Force
B.S., United States Air Force Academy, 2004

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN NATIONAL SECURITY AFFAIRS

from the

**NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
September 2005**

Author: John P. Oberle

Approved by: Edward A. Olsen
Thesis Advisor

H. Lyman Miller
Co-Advisor

Douglas Porch
Chairman, Department of National Security Affairs

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

ABSTRACT

The United States-Japanese missile defense cooperation signals yet another step in Japan's continuing trend of "normalization" and official acknowledgement that Japan has a significant military force. This thesis analyzes the current status of the Japanese missile defense debate and assesses factors shaping the Japanese commitment to joint missile defense with the United States. Three major inter-related trends mark the course of Japanese post-Cold War SDF evolution, relations with the United States and the missile defense debate. These include a willingness to relax legal considerations on the use of military force, the expansion of the roles for the JSDF, and the responsiveness of Japanese decision makers to external factors, notably the requirement to improve relations with the United States and the threat perceived from North Korea. This represents a shift to a more military-based security outlook away from the traditional notion of "comprehensive security." These trends point invariably to the amendment of Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution. To maximize U.S. interests, Washington must pursue a balanced and limited missile defense in East Asia and actively undertake measures to avoid the perception of a threat to Chinese nuclear deterrence.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
A.	PURPOSE.....	1
B.	IMPORTANCE.....	1
C.	MAJOR QUESTIONS.....	2
D.	METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES.....	2
E.	ORGANIZATION	3
II.	TREND OF THE EXPANDING ROLES AND CAPACITIES OF THE JAPANESE SELF DEFENSE FORCE	7
A.	EVOLUTION OF THE SDF THROUGHOUT THE COLD WAR	7
B.	EARLY DEPLOYMENTS ABROAD AFTER THE COLD WAR.....	9
C.	CHANGING LEGAL DYNAMICS.....	14
D.	RECENT DEPLOYMENTS TO THE PRESENT	15
E.	TRENDS AND SUMMARY	17
III.	JAPANESE COLD WAR AND POST-COLD WAR SECURITY RELATIONSHIPS.....	19
A.	JAPANESE COLD WAR RELATIONS.....	19
1.	United States – Japan Relations	19
2.	Japanese Notion of Comprehensive Security	22
3.	Bilateral Relations with China and South Korea	23
a.	<i>Sino-Japanese Relations.....</i>	<i>24</i>
b.	<i>Bilateral Relations with South Korea.....</i>	<i>26</i>
4.	Summary of Japanese Cold War Relations.....	28
B.	JAPANESE POST-COLD WAR RELATIONS	28
1.	U.S.-Japan Relations.....	28
2.	Japanese Multilateral Relations	31
a.	<i>United Nations.....</i>	<i>31</i>
b.	<i>Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation.....</i>	<i>32</i>
c.	<i>Association of Southeast Asian Nations</i>	<i>33</i>
3.	Summary of Japanese Post-Cold War Relations	34
C.	TRENDS AND SUMMARY	35
IV.	BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE DEBATE	37
A.	NORTH KOREAN NUCLEAR CRISIS	37
B.	NORTH KOREA’S BALLISTIC MISSILE CAPABILITIES	42
1.	Hwasong 5, 6/ “Scud B, C”	42
2.	Nodong I.....	43
3.	Nodong B.....	43
4.	Taepodong I, II.....	44
5.	North Korean Missile Threat Summary	44
C.	CHINA’S THEATER MISSILE CAPABILITIES.....	44
1.	DF-11.....	45
2.	DF-15.....	45

3.	JL-1.....	46
4.	DF-21	46
5.	DF-3.....	46
6.	DF-4.....	46
7.	Summary of Chinese Theater Missile Capabilities.....	47
D.	BRIEF OVERVIEW OF MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINOLOGY.....	47
E.	EVOLUTION OF U.S.-JAPAN TMD COOPERATION	49
F.	CURRENT INTERNAL DEBATE ON TMD IN JAPAN	54
1.	The Prime Minister and the Cabinet	55
2.	The JDA and the Self-Defense Forces.....	58
a.	<i>Japanese Ground Self Defense Force</i>	58
b.	<i>Japanese Air Self Defense Force</i>	59
c.	<i>Japanese Marine Self Defense Force</i>	59
3.	The Ministry of Foreign Affairs	60
4.	The Ministry of Finance	61
5.	The Diet.....	61
a.	<i>Liberal Democratic Party</i>	63
b.	<i>New Komeito</i>	63
c.	<i>Democratic Party of Japan</i>	64
d.	<i>Japanese Communist Party and Social Democratic Party</i>	64
7.	The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry (METI) and Private Businesses	65
8.	The Public and the Media	65
9.	Alliance Maintenance	66
10.	Financial Constraints.....	66
11.	Legal Considerations	67
12.	Technical feasibility and Architecture Issues.....	70
13.	Industrial/Commercial Considerations	70
14.	The China Factor	71
15.	The North Korea Factor.....	71
G.	TRENDS AND SUMMARY	72
V.	REGIONAL PERCEPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF JAPANESE TMD...73	
A.	SOUTH KOREA.....	73
B.	CHINA	74
C.	TAIWAN.....	76
D.	NORTH KOREA	77
E.	RUSSIA.....	78
F.	UNITED STATES.....	79
G.	TRENDS AND SUMMARY	81
VI.	CONCLUSION	83
A.	TRENDS	83
B.	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UNITED STATES POLICY.....	85
1.	Possible Policy Options.....	85
a.	<i>Abandonment of Missile Defense Efforts in the Region</i>	85
b.	<i>Aggressive Pursuit of Missile Defense in the Region</i>	85

c.	<i>Balanced and Limited Pursuit of Missile Defense in the Region</i>	85
2.	Recommended Course of Action	86
	LIST OF REFERENCES	89
	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	97

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Key Domestic Players and Issues for Japanese Missile Defense	55
----------	--	----

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

ABL	Airborne Laser
ABM	Anti-Ballistic Missile
APEC	Asian Pacific Economic Council
ARF	ASEAN Regional Forum
ASDF	Air Self Defense Force
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BADGE	Base Air Defense Ground Environment
BMD	Ballistic Missile Defense
C2BM	Command, Control and Battle Management
C4I	Command Control, Communications, Computers and Information
CEP	Circular Error Probability
DPJ	Democratic Party of Japan
DSP	Democratic Socialist Party
GMD	Ground Based Midcourse Defense
GNP	Gross National Product
GPALS	Global Protection Against Limited Strikes
GPS	Global Positioning System
GSDF	Ground Self Defense Force
JCP	Japanese Communist Party
JDA	Japanese Defense Agency
JSDF	Japanese Self Defense Force
JSP	Japanese Socialist Party
KEI	Kinetic Energy Interceptors
kt	kiloton
LDP	Liberal Democratic Party
MDA	Missile Defense Agency
METI	Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry
MIRV	Multiple Independently Targetable Re-entry Vehicles
MOFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MRV	Multiple Re-entry Vehicles
MSDF	Marine Self Defense Force
NTW	Navy Theater Wide
ODA	Office of Development Aid
ONUMOZ	United Nations Operation in Mozambique
PAC-3	PATRIOT Advanced Capability - 3
PRC	People's Republic of China
SDF	Self Defense Force
SDI	Strategic Defense Initiative
SDIO WESTPAC	Strategic Defense Initiative Office Western Pacific
SDP	Social Democratic Party
SM-3	Standard Missile-3
SRBM	Short Range Ballistic Missile

TCOG	Trilateral Coordination Oversight Group
THAAD	Theater High Altitude Area Defense
TMD	Theater Missile Defense
UN	United Nations
UNAMIR	United Nations Assistance Mission in Rwanda
UNDOF	United Disengagement Observer Force
UNTAC	United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my Thesis Advisor Professor Ed Olsen for his corrections, comments and putting up with my often laughable excuses for grammar. He also has my gratitude for having enough confidence in my work to brief Rear Admiral Kelly on the contents of my thesis in August 2005. To my Co-Advisor Professor Lyman Miller also goes my gratitude for his willingness to put up with long-distance corrections and swift identification of glaring errors. To both go my thanks for their helpful suggestions and efforts in overlooking my thesis despite not teaching classes at NPS during my last quarter. To Professor Twomey, my appreciation for allowing me the opportunity to brief Rear Admiral Kelly and giving me a good kick in the pants when I needed it.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

I. INTRODUCTION

A. PURPOSE

The purpose of this thesis is to examine the debate driving the Japanese missile defense system and the implications of its implementation. This debate represents yet another step in Japan's continuing trend of "normalization" and official recognition of its military. This thesis analyzes the current status of the Japanese military and assesses in detail the factors shaping the Japanese decision to implement a ballistic missile defense system with the United States and its implications. It draws conclusions and makes recommendations regarding possible policy alterations for the United States in response to Japanese implementation of a ballistic missile defense system in order to advance the mutual interests of the United States and Japan in the region.

B. IMPORTANCE

The United States has a direct interest in the peace and security of the East Asian region. Regional stability promotes economic prosperity, strengthening ties between the United States and its trading partners. Economic prosperity encourages openness of countries' economic systems which in turn encourages political openness and the spread of freedom throughout the area. The spread of freedom and wealth drives opposition to authoritarianism, increased awareness of the responsibilities of governments to ensure basic human rights and in full circle, enhances peace and security in the East Asian region. To maintain this stability, the United States actively works in the region through its projection of economic, political and military presence to deter aggression and promote integration.

As the closest U.S. ally in the East Asian region, the status of Japan's Self Defense Force has important implications for burden-sharing. As Japan continues its eventual progression towards a military capacity unconstrained by its past and consistent with its economic and political power, one of the possible policy options includes a ballistic missile defense against nuclear and other threats posed either by North Korea or China. The ballistic missile defense option is one advocated by the current Bush administration as part of a broader campaign of counter-proliferation and non-

proliferation of nuclear weapons technology and delivery systems that pose a threat to the United States and its allies.

Any Japanese decision regarding a ballistic missile defense system will have important ramifications for the U.S. – Japan security relationship and the bilateral relationships of each country with other nations in the region. How their decision regarding missile defense fits into their legal framework and interpretation thereof will have increasing relevance as calls for constitutional revision continue to increase. In an atmosphere highlighted by the North Korean nuclear program and increasing Chinese power, especial attention must be paid to the changing security dynamics and the role of Japan in its partnership with the United States in the region.

C. MAJOR QUESTIONS

The major question is whether or not Japan will cooperate in a ballistic missile defense program with the United States. To answer this question, it is necessary to look at the background of Japanese security decisions following the Second World War as well as debates regarding ballistic missile defense specifically. A brief overview of the expansion of the roles and capabilities of the Japanese Self Defense Forces and Japanese-United States relations will be undertaken to understand important trends necessary for establishing the context of the missile defense debate. Key actors, issues and events in the missile defense debate will be discussed to identify trends and implications. The next question is how other countries in the region view the idea of a missile defense with Japanese participation, which will affect the Japanese notion of “comprehensive security,” the U.S.-Japan security relationship and U.S. interests in the area. Lastly, what United States policy actions are called for in light of these possible developments?

D. METHODOLOGY AND SOURCES

The methodology used in this thesis is primarily a process-tracing analysis in which possible outcomes are analyzed using current and past trends regarding the expansion of the allowed and accepted role and capacity of Japan’s defense structure and ballistic missile defense. Sources include official documents and publications by the Japanese government, statements by Japanese officials, and agreements between the United States and Japan. News releases, past and present, supplemented by the

secondary writings of academic specialists are analyzed as this is an ongoing issue. Care is taken to assess the differences between official positions and actual positions and realities, as this is an even more relevant feature of Japanese policy. First, the development in roles and capabilities of the Japanese Self Defense Forces following the First Gulf War due to participation in peacekeeping mission will be overviewed in order to determine any relevant trends for the missile defense debate. This will be connected with the overall conduct of Japanese foreign policy followed by a detailed discussion of the missile defense cooperation debate between Japan and the United States as well as domestically in Japan. Emphasis will be placed on trends and issues to broaden the applicability of this thesis.

E. ORGANIZATION

Chapter II details the trend of expanding roles and capacities of the Japanese Self Defense Force (JSDF) despite of Article 9 restrictions in the Japanese Constitution. This is useful in ascertaining the likelihood of Japanese missile defense system development as it is seen as an extension of this expansion. It first offers a historical overview of the steady evolution of the JSDF during the Cold War period in coordination with its security alliance with the United States. It then focuses on the Post-Cold War development of the JSDF and the surrounding legal framework in response to world developments with specific focus on how Japan's involvement in international peacekeeping efforts has accelerated this development. Of particular note is how debates and decisions regarding the deployment of the Self Defense Forces are a serious indicator of Japan's normalization efforts.

Chapter III analyzes trends in Japanese foreign relations from the post-World War II timeframe until the present in order to understand the context of Tokyo's security decisions. The chapter begins by summarizing Japan's relations with the United States during the Cold War followed by an explanation of the Japanese notion of comprehensive security. The Post-Cold War section of the chapter is divided into Japanese relations with the United States and its involvement in several multilateral institutions, both regionally and worldwide. Comprehensive security efforts led Japan to aggressively pursue regional economic leadership to create mutual dependence within the region during the Cold War, making Japan an important upholder of capitalism and part of the

United States' Cold War effort. After the Cold War, negative reaction to Japanese "checkbook diplomacy", especially from the United States, caused Japan to expand not only its economic component of security, but its political and military branches as well. At the same time, the United States still remains Japan's key provider of direct military defense and its most essential ally.

Chapter IV deals directly with the issue of a ballistic missile defense system. It begins with background on the North Korean nuclear crisis. This ongoing event has provided much of the impetus for the debate regarding ballistic missile defense in Japan. This is followed by a discussion of North Korean and Chinese missile capabilities which heavily overshadow the debate as well. After the description of the military threats facing Japan, an explanation of ballistic and theater missile defense precedes a discussion of the history of missile defense cooperation between Japan and the United States. The chapter ends with a section summarizing the major factors in the current internal debate regarding missile defense.

Chapter V assesses perceptions of a ballistic missile defense by key players in the region to analyze possible decisions and responses regarding the issue. Included are the views and likely responses of South Korea, China, Taiwan, North Korea, Russia and the United States towards a Japanese missile defense system. The likely course of action must balance the benefits gained from the support of the United States and increased military security with the negative perceptions held by South Korea, China and North Korea. It details why Japan is still likely to pursue missile defense despite these negative elements.

Chapter VI concludes the thesis with a summary of relevant trends found in the research. These include the implications of the willingness to relax legal considerations in the face of political necessity, the gradual expansion of the roles and capabilities of the Japanese Self Defense Forces, and the responsiveness of Japanese decision makers to external factors, including most noticeably the security relationship with the United States and the threat from North Korea. It finishes with a section discussing the broad policy options Washington has regarding missile defense in East Asia, which includes ending all plans for a theater missile defense program, an aggressive pursuit of missile

defense in East Asia, or keeping the capability of missile defenses strong, but limited. It explains the benefits of a missile defense system while indicating measures which would alleviate Chinese concerns over its implementation.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

II. TREND OF THE EXPANDING ROLES AND CAPACITIES OF THE JAPANESE SELF DEFENSE FORCE

After World War II, the Japanese constitution renounced the sovereign right of the Japanese nation to maintain a military establishment and the use of force as a policy tool. While originally imposed upon the Japanese people, it was later embraced by the war-weary Japanese. However, in 1950, the creation of the National Police Reserve of 75,000 marked the beginning of a US-backed Cold War policy that led to the establishment of the Japanese Self Defense Force (SDF). Since the failure of “checkbook diplomacy” during Operation Desert Storm, Japan has further increased its efforts to play a role in the international community, including many peacekeeping operations where Japanese SDF personnel were deployed, the most recent and notable being Iraq in 2004. This is being done as Japan’s seeks a permanent seat on the United Nations (UN) Security Council, a role demanding large scale foreign policy involvement to include military capacity.

This chapter will provide a brief historical background about the evolution of what is currently the SDF and look into the decision-making processes in response to international and domestic pressures that occurred during the string of deployments starting in the 1990s. Taking into account the gradual “normalization” of roles and capabilities given to the SDF, this chapter will suggest, despite constitutional barriers and a general public aversion to the use of force, that the day when the amending of the Japanese constitution to include the right to officially maintain a military is not far-off. As the decision-making process in regards to defense policy hinges largely on classical Japanese consensus building, the change will occur sooner rather than later in the event of large outside pressure or an international or domestic crisis.

A. EVOLUTION OF THE SDF THROUGHOUT THE COLD WAR

In Article 9 of the Japanese constitution adopted in 1947, the Japanese renounced war and the threat or the use of force. This included the maintenance of land, sea and air forces and other war potential.¹ However, by 1950, a National Police Reserve of 75,000

¹ Article 9, The Constitution of Japan.

strong was created in response to perceived internal security threats from communism and subversion. With the advent of the Korean War, American planners saw the defense of Japan now as an aspect of the Cold War and backed away from the vision of a purely pacifist Japan. By 1952, although not providing troops, Japan was providing war material for the UN forces in Korea, giving the Japanese economy a large boost. In 1951, the Mutual Security Treaty between the United States and Japan was signed, forming the basis for the defense relationship of the two countries. This entailed largely the Japanese role under the defense umbrella of the United States in exchange for basing rights in Japan. With the exception of a few instances, internal disorder was quickly settled and the need for these defense forces for internal security diminished, but the forces remained.² Under the Self-Defense Forces Law of 1954, the Police Reserve was renamed the Self Defense Force and mandated the use of air, land and sea forces to protect the peace and security of the Japanese nation against direct and indirect aggression. It was divided into three components, the Ground Self Defense Force (GSDF), the Maritime Self Defense Force (MSDF) and the Air Self Defense Force (ASDF). This began the gradual buildup of Japanese forces that continues to this day.³

In 1960, the Mutual Security Alliance was modified into the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security and met with dissatisfaction from the Japanese public, but still affirmed the relationship between the two countries. As both the Japanese economy and American commitments in the world heightened, the “Nixon doctrine” in 1969 urged American allies in Asia to assume a larger share of their financial burden for defense. Of important note is although the Japanese re-signed the Mutual Security Treaty in 1970, thus making it permanent until abrogated, they did refuse to send troops to support the American effort in Vietnam.⁴ It was also during the 1970s that Director General Sakata Michita of the Defense Agency implemented the 1% of the GNP restriction for the military budget. In 1979, the Defense Agency began to clearly define the role of the SDF with six main functions, including the maintenance of an adequate surveillance posture, responsibility for internal security, the ability to withstand limited and small-scale

² Louis D. Hayes, *Introduction to Japanese Politics*, Armonk: East Gate, 2001, 290-291.

³ “Japan Defense Agency - Japan Self-Defense Force,” www.globalsecurity.org. [10 Dec 04]

⁴ Duncan McCargo, *Contemporary Japan*, 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave, 2004, 184.

aggression unaided, the ability of forces to utilize command communications, transportation, rescue and supply and maintenance, the training of SDF personnel, and a continuation of the Self-Defense Forces Law of 1954 and perhaps most important in the eye of the Japanese public, the ability to carry out disaster relief operations within the country of Japan.⁵

The 1980s saw the prime ministership of Nakasone Yasuhiro, a former director general of the Defense Agency, from 1982 until 1987. This period continued the growing role of the Japanese SDF as Nakasone advocated the responsibility of defending sea lanes within 1,000 nautical miles of Japanese shores, the Mid-Term Defense Estimate which was a shift away from minimalist defense capabilities toward more defensive power, and the abrogation of the 1% limit on defense spending. While he was able to implement a more active defense policy in terms of the SDF in part due to his close relationship with American President Ronald Reagan, he was still unable to successfully back measures for amending the Constitution, upgrading the Defense Agency to a ministry, revise the security treaty with the United States, or dramatically increase defense spending.⁶ All the same, he was able to introduce more debate over the SDF within Japan and continue the trend of its expanding role. Throughout the 1980s, public opinion also grew in support of the SDF, with 58% approving the defense budget in 1987 that broke the 1% limit. Also, according to a 1988 survey, over half the people polled voiced an interest in the SDF and over 76 percent said they were favorably impressed. While recognizing its main goal was national security, 77% felt it was best utilized in disaster relief. Consequently, the SDF engaged heavily in civic action and disaster relief with broad public support.⁷

B. EARLY DEPLOYMENTS ABROAD AFTER THE COLD WAR

In the years after the Cold War, Japan continued its evolution in roles for the SDF. To better understand this phenomenon, it is important to look at both the actions and the interpretations of the legal framework for instances regarding SDF deployment. The United States-led and UN sponsored action against Iraq in response to Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait in 1990 was an opportunity for Japan to demonstrate to the

⁵ Hayes, 291.

⁶ McCargo, 185-196.

⁷ "Japan Defense Agency - Japan Self-Defense Force," www.globalsecurity.org.

world its role in the international community. Especially relevant was Japan's status as an economic superpower and its heavy reliance on Middle Eastern oil. International opinion, especially in the United States, urged Japan to contribute at the bare minimum logistical support. The response of Prime Minister Kaifu Toshiki was to ban all oil imports from Iraq and propose several billion dollars worth of funding, the sending of medical personnel and civilian logistical support. To better enable this action, the Kaifu government sought to pass a UN Peace Force Co-operation Bill where personnel from the SDF would comprise a Peace Co-Operation Corps. They would no longer be technically considered members of the SDF while still receiving benefits and would be limited strictly to non-combat roles such as election monitoring, the supervision of cease-fires, logistics, medical activities and telecommunications. This was all said to be at the behest of the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) Secretary-General Ozawa Ichiro. However, not only did the public have doubts with only 21% in favor of the bill and only 15% in favor of SDF deployment overseas, but the Democratic Socialist Party (DSP), the Komeito and the Japanese Socialist Party (JSP) were highly critical of this bill. Even the LDP was not firmly behind this legislation, and it was decided that a 13 billion dollar sum, a total over four times greater the annual UN peacekeeping budget, would be given to the coalition in the Gulf and no troops deployed.⁸ This made Japan a non-contributing partner in terms of personnel during the only two instances of direct UN-sponsored uses of force, the other being the Korean War. After the cease-fire, Japanese minesweepers were sent to the Gulf, but this action was considered "too little too late" by the international community, which greatly criticized Japan for its "checkbook diplomacy."⁹ Even though the peacekeeping bill failed, its introduction does represent at least a critical juncture where serious debate was conducted for SDF deployment. Despite criticism over the late and minimal contributions in minesweeping made by the MSDF, the fact that parliamentary approval was obtained for an SDF deployment for purposes other than ceremonies and joint operations with the United States is another instance of a liberal interpretation of Article 9 of the constitution.

⁸ J. A. A. Stockwin, *Governing Japan*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999, 72-75.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 76-77.

The Japanese response to international criticism was significant. Public opinion itself began to shift in favor of the deployment of SDF personnel for peacekeeping operations, moving from 15% in 1990 to about 68% in 1992.¹⁰ Coupled with this swing in public opinion were the efforts of the aforementioned Ozawa in compromising with the Komeito and the DSP to accept an International Peace Cooperation bill. The JSP was still adamantly opposed to the bill on the basis of the unconstitutionality of the SDF itself and used the “cow-walking” tactic in an unsuccessful bid to prevent the measure from passing. In the light of public opinion, this was a largely unpopular move. While the compromise would lead to a splintering of the LDP later on, it was successful in implementing into law a profound effort by the Japanese government to deploy SDF personnel around the world.¹¹ The specifics of the International Peace Cooperation Law stated five principles regarding SDF personnel deployment in UN peacekeeping operations and represented the compromise necessary to gain consensus on the bill. These included that all parties agree to a cease-fire, all parties and host nations consent to UN peacekeeping operations and Japan’s participation in those operations, operations should remain impartial, the Japanese government may withdraw SDF members if it feels the first three principles are no longer in effect, and the use of weapons is limited to protect the lives of SDF personnel. In addition, any deployment required Diet approval and the law itself was subject to review in three years. Though the bill allowed the SDF to perform the “assignments of core units” for peacekeeping such as supervision of combatant disarmament, the use of personnel in patrolling buffer zones, and the collection and disposal of abandoned weapons, a “freeze” was placed on these duties because consensus could not be reached.¹² Thus the legal framework shifted from forbidding the deployment of SDF personnel outside of Japan for peacekeeping operations to allowing it in the instances of a ceasefire and only for non-combatant roles in a narrow range of circumstances.

¹⁰ Ishizuka Katsumi, “The Evolution of Japan’s Policy towards UN Peace Operations,” paper presented at the Fifteenth Annual Meeting for the Academic Council on the UN System (ACUNS), at Cascais, Portugal, 21-23 June 2002, 11.

¹¹ Hayes, 78-79.

¹² “Japan’s Contributions to International Peace,” International Peace Cooperation Headquarters, http://www.pko.go.jp/PKO_E/pref_e.html#5rules. [11 Dec 04]

The new law was put to the test over the next several years with the deployment of SDF personnel to Cambodia during UNTAC in September of 1992, Mozambique in support of ONUMOZ in 1993, Zaire and Tanzania to support the Rwandan mission UNAMIR in 1994, and the Golan Heights to support UNDOF in 1996.¹³ The deployment to Cambodia of over 600 troops was a large psychological step in response to international criticism, if not necessarily in terms of contribution. It also brought to light important issues regarding effective coordination between the SDF and UN-sponsored forces. Of special importance was, despite a breakdown in the cease-fire and hence a violation of the five principles, the Japanese government did not pull out the SDF, even after the death of two personnel. This was further emphasized when several police officers abandoned their posts in protest. Another issue was the limits placed on the use of force. SDF members could only use weapons in their own self defense, while UN forces could defend themselves as well as use force to remove obstacles to completion of mission objectives. At the same time, the SDF engineering troops engaged in patrolling, securing election monitoring, and transporting ballot boxes, all of which were part of the “frozen” duties not allowed to SDF personnel at that time.¹⁴

The other missions were undertaken more in response to internal pressures, notably by Ozawa or the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is unofficially motivated by the idea of a permanent seat on the UN Security Council. ONUMOZ saw the introduction of SDF members into staff positions unlike UNTAC, and the deployment to Zaire and Tanzania to support UNAMIR was significant for two reasons. The first is that it took place outside of Rwanda because there was not a cease-fire in accordance with the five principles. The second is that it was a purely voluntary mission not requested by the Secretary General of the UN or a joint venture with a coalition of other nations, which shows Japanese willingness to now support missions of their own volition and where a cease-fire has not been signed before the sending in of troops.¹⁵

¹³ “UN Peacekeeping Operations,” Ministry of Foreign Affairs Japan, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/pamph2000/pko.html>. [11 Dec 04]

¹⁴ Ichizuka, 17-18.

¹⁵ Ibid., 16.

The sending of SDF troops to the Golan Heights in support of UNDOF at the start of 1996 is important because it emphasizes how deeply domestic political policy is important in shaping the issue. The debate over the deployment began in 1995, a tumultuous year with regards to defense policy. The Kobe earthquake and the Aum Shinri Kyo sarin gas attacks put the SDF under fire for poor handling of disaster relief in regards to the earthquake and collaboration of some members of the SDF with the Aum Shinri Kyo.¹⁶ Since the LDP's fall in 1993, it had to resort to coalition building with other factions, which was reflected in defense policy. The National Defense Program Outline was rewritten to replace the one from 1976 and was a vague compromise. Issues like the ban on collective self-defense and arms exports were left out at the request of the LDP, perhaps reflecting in part concern over the previous year when Japan refused an American request for Japanese help in regards to possible hostilities with North Korea in 1994. On the other hand, Social Democratic Party (SDP) which was composed of former JSP members was able to gain large cuts in the increases of defense spending and acquisitions proposed for the next four years. It was in this political climate the debate over sending SDF troops to the Golan Heights took place, and opposition parties like the SDP delayed it from occurring for about a year. In the end, it was given approval, but not without a continuation of the "freeze" in the International Peace Cooperation Law and the stipulation that any withdrawal of SDF personnel would be made solely by Japanese officials. Furthermore, SDF personnel were restricted from duties requiring the use of weapons nor would they transport weaponry or armed troops of other nations.¹⁷ In effect, this reflected the political reality of "one step forward, half-step back" in regards to significant changes in the role of the SDF. Despite the watered-down nature of the final mission, it is still an evolution as it does mean the existence of troops in the Middle East. This is significant not only because of how the region is prone to violence, but also because of Japanese dependency on Middle Eastern oil.

The above series of peacekeeping operations highlighted several features as well as inconsistencies of Japanese policy put into implementation. The first is the

¹⁶ Stockwin, 87-88.

¹⁷ Aurelia George Mulgan, "International Peacekeeping and Japan's Response to the Challenge of Collective Security," paper presented during RSPAS Seminar, Australian National University, 5 March 1996, 16-17,20.

deployment of SDF personnel to UNTAC was largely a response to international criticism whereas the others are more the result of internal pressure and maneuverings. The second is the insistence on adhering to some of the principles of the 1992 International Peace Cooperation Law while ignoring others, hindering cooperation efforts between Japan and other nations. The third is the continuation of only incremental increases in the role of the SDF in the absence of significant international pressure or events.

C. CHANGING LEGAL DYNAMICS

After the sending of troops to the Golan Heights in January of 1996, no new peacekeeping or humanitarian aid involving SDF personnel was performed until 1999 in support of East Timorese refugees. However, the debate and legislation during this time was very important in the ongoing evolution of the SDF. In 1996, American President Clinton and Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto reaffirmed the security relationship between the two countries and set about a reevaluation of the defense guidelines from the late 1970s. The new U.S.-Japan Defense Guidelines were completed in 1997 and reflected concerns over the post-Cold War situation, to include the impact of the Gulf War, possible nuclearization of the Korean peninsula, and China's rising presence in Asia.¹⁸ The new guidelines added to what was allowed for Japanese cooperation including broadened acknowledgement of various normal and peacetime operations to include disaster relief, peace keeping operation, humanitarian operations and more information sharing. It also dealt with principles regarding an attack against Japan itself, giving Japan primary responsibility to deal with internal matters. Even more importantly, it dealt with events or crises not just in Japan, but also in "surrounding areas," which broadens the definition of the traditional bare minimum for defense capability.¹⁹

Many of the above changes were seen as outside the framework of the Constitution and legislation was introduced to provide a legal basis for them, as there was outside pressure since it was already worked out with the United States. The debate over the guidelines led to the passing of several laws and measures, including the Regional

¹⁸ Hayes, 292.

¹⁹ Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation, U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee release, http://www.fas.org/news/japan/97092302_epo.html. [12 Dec 04]

Contingency Security Law, a revision of the 1954 Self Defense Force Law, the Surrounding Areas Emergency Law and the Maritime Intercept Operations Law and the beginnings of a five-year review and debate over revising the Constitution in February 2000.²⁰ This gave guidance on how Japanese forces may assist U.S. forces in an emergency in the area around Japan, the ability to conduct Search and Rescue, Maritime Intercept Operations and Non-Combatant Evacuation Operations during rear-area support, giving the SDF more roles in supporting the defense relationship with the United States. Another change of special import is that the International Peace Cooperation Law was amended in 1998 in recognition of problems brought up over the past years of Japanese experience in peacekeeping operations. Included changes were the allowance of election monitoring activities by regional organizations other than the United Nations, the removal of the requirement of a cease-fire in humanitarian operations involving the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, and the use of weapons whenever their superiors ordered them to.²¹ The introduction of serious debate in amending the Constitution represents a serious shift in domestic Japanese political thinking, partly in response to internal pressures as well as outside international pressure.

D. RECENT DEPLOYMENTS TO THE PRESENT

SDF personnel were sent to Indonesia in support of East Timorese refugees in 1999-2000, partly thanks to the modification of the International Peace Cooperation Law.²² The continued presence of Japanese peacekeeping efforts in the world was to pay off later, and the clearly defining instance in recent years was the September 11th attack against the United States. Immediately following, Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi, whose prime ministership has seen the largest advances towards the de jure and de facto enlargement of SDF roles, called for Japanese action and soon the MSDF sent carriers to conduct intelligence operations in the Indian Ocean. In addition, the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law was passed with around only a month of debate and the International Peace Cooperation Law was modified once again. The Anti-Terrorism

²⁰ Stephen E. Duke, "Japan's Constitution, prospects for change: impact on U.S. presence in Japan," M.A. thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, 2001, 40.

²¹ Murata Koji, "Japan," Humanitarian Intervention: The Evolving Asian Debate, Japan Center for International Exchange, 2003, 10.

²² "International Peace Cooperation Activities," CAO, <http://www.cao.go.jp/peace.pdf>

Special Measures Law is remarkable not only for its unprecedented speed of passage, but in that it allows the SDF to support combat actions in non-combatant roles for the first time in its history, even if it is limited mostly to logistics and intelligence. Furthermore, it extends this capacity to nations other than the United States and allows SDF personnel to use weapons to protect not just themselves, but those under their care. It also allowed SDF members to provide humanitarian relief to countries still in conflict with host nation consent, which is a step further than the International Peace Cooperation Law at that time.²³ The quickness to reach consensus showed the impact international pressure had on the domestic debate of defense policy. In addition, Prime Minister Koizumi's popularity played a large role in enabling him to push through measures as well. Surveys of Japanese intellectuals and constitutional scholars during this time period showed over 65% in favor of a revision of the Constitution, over 50% affirming the constitutionality of the SDF, and 60% believing in Japan's right to exercise collective self-defense.²⁴ When operations were conducted in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, it was a debatable participation in collective security, but there was relatively little international concern, perhaps due to psychologically visible Japanese peacekeeping efforts by the SDF.

The amendment of the International Peace Cooperation Law was undertaken to allow a Japanese presence for Afghanistan peacekeeping efforts, to alleviate some concerns over past peacekeeping experiences and to provide the extension of some benefits of the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law to peacekeeping efforts. As evidence of the consensus on this bill, it was supported by all the leading coalition parties as well as the largest opposition party. One important aspect was the lifting of the "freeze" on core peacekeeping activities, meaning SDF personnel could now supervise combatant disarmament, use personnel in patrolling buffer zones, and collect and dispose of abandoned weapons. Also included was the ability of SDF members to use force to protect those under their care in addition to self-defense and the use of weapons to protect arms stores.²⁵ The deployments of SDF personnel to Pakistan for Afghanistan refugee

²³ Paul Midford, "Japan's Response to Terror," *Asian Survey* 43, no. 2 (Mar/Apr 2003): 332-333.

²⁴ Sorimachi Katsuo, "Sorimachi Speaks," *Tokyo Legal Mind*, http://www.lec-jp.com/speaks/info_011.html [12 Dec 04]

²⁵ Ichizuka, 24-25.

relief and to East Timor took advantage of the new and amended laws and were yet another broadening of the permissible use of the SDF overseas.

The latest in deployments for the SDF is the sending of troops to Kuwait and Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and peacekeeping efforts there. The decision was made on December 9, 2003 by Prime Minister Koizumi and planned for activities centered around the city of Samawah in southeastern Iraq.²⁶ As of December 9, 2004, the Iraqi mission is extended for at least another year. As backing for his decision, Koizumi emphasized the non-combatant nature of the deployment and the gratitude of the Iraqi government and citizenry.²⁷ While Koizumi has been able to push the deployment of troops to Iraq, he has faced stiffer opposition from many fronts in the absence of an immediate crisis or external pressure to lend his cause support.

E. TRENDS AND SUMMARY

Examining the trends behind the laws governing the deployment of the SDF overseas and the actual deployments themselves demonstrates a slow incremental trend towards an increase in the role and capabilities of the SDF punctuated by periods of fast development due to outside, foreign pressure, largely from the United States. Starting from the First Gulf War, the SDF went from not being able to be deployed overseas for peacekeeping operations to being able to support peacekeeping operations in a very limited capacity. Since the International Peace Cooperation Law was passed in 1992, this role has expanded in terms of capability and support as agreements with the United States or peacekeeping operations began to highlight inadequacies of current interpretations of Article 9 and push the envelope towards change. After 9/11, momentum was gathered and the SDF was enabled to support combat operations in a non-combative capacity and recent deployments to the Middle East. This points to the large extent of flexibility with which the Constitution is interpreted.

The continual evolution in roles for the SDF causes the issue of amending the Constitution to loom even larger in the minds of policy makers and the Japanese public,

²⁶ “500 to 700 Ground Troops to be Sent to Iraq,” The Japan Times Online, <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/getarticle.pl5?nn20031209a1.htm> [12 Dec 04].

²⁷ 2ND LD: Japan extends SDF mission to Iraq for 1 year,” <http://asia.news.yahoo.com/041209/kyodo/d86s1bsg0.html> [12 Dec 04].

whether or not they support the roles of the SDF or even the existence of the SDF itself. Despite public support for the SDF's role in peacekeeping operations, there is still a societal aversion to the use of force and the establishment of a military in official terms, at least. On the political side, Koizumi and the LDP are the main backers of expanding the role of the SDF and amending the Constitution to abolish Article 9. The Komeito is in alignment with the LDP and supports UN peacekeeping operations, but they wish to have ten years of consensus before an amendment takes place. The socialist and communist parties are against a large role for the SDF to varying degrees. The SDP, despite recognition of the SDF during its coalition with the LDP back in 1993, is strongly against the existence of the SDF and interprets Article 9 in a very strict sense. The DPJ supports the SDF, but only at the classic "bare minimum for self-defense" and is against collective-defense or any operations outside of strictly defending Japanese territory. The Japanese Communist Party (JCP) is against the SDF, saying it is unconstitutional.²⁸

Judging from past trends, the highly contentious nature of the issue makes it unlikely that a firm decision will be made in the absence of either a large international crisis or one faced by Japan domestically, most likely in the form of a terrorist attack. The other main international concerns, security or otherwise, remain the same as they have for the past decade, namely China's tipping of the strategic balance in Asia, North Korean nuclearization and the reunification of the Koreas, the U.S.-Japan security relationship and Japan's bid for a permanent seat on the UN Security Council.

²⁸ Robert Shu, "Japan's strategic future: coalition operations," M.A. thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, 2004, 42-44.

III. JAPANESE COLD WAR AND POST-COLD WAR SECURITY RELATIONSHIPS

The development of Japanese security relationships during and after the Cold War is a reflection of both United States security concerns and the Japanese notion of comprehensive security. The imposition of Article 9 in the Japanese “peace constitution” resulted in both the Japanese looking to the United States as the provider of its primary defense umbrella and having to resort to other means than strictly defense matters in its pursuit of security. Consequently, during the Cold War, Japan focused upon economic measures and sought a position of economic leadership within Asia. At the same time, a gradual increase in the roles of defense capabilities in Japan occurred, largely through negotiations of the U.S.-Japan security relationship. After the Cold War, Japan has sought more leadership in the international community through multilateral organizations after being roundly criticized for its “checkbook diplomacy” during the First Gulf War. However, its support for the U.S.-Japan security relationship has remained, especially in recent years during the ongoing Global War on Terrorism.

A. JAPANESE COLD WAR RELATIONS

Japanese security relations during the Cold War can be analyzed by looking at how Japan’s bilateral relations with the United States shaped its security policy, broader trends in its notion of comprehensive security which hinged largely on low-key economic leadership efforts in Asia, and bilateral relations with other countries, notably China and South Korea.

1. United States – Japan Relations

It is impossible to discuss Japanese Cold War Security Policy without examining first the bilateral relationship between Japan and the United States. The imposition of a new constitution in 1947 by the United States left Japan with a legacy that shapes their foreign policy to this very day: the inability, in principle at least, to maintain military forces. Under Article 9 it declared “the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes...land, sea and air forces, as well as other war potential will never

be maintained. The right of belligerency of the state will not be recognized.”²⁹ This was an effort by the United States to prevent any sort of military resurgence by Japan in the future. However, the escalation of the Cold War, especially emphasized by the Korean War saw American policy makers viewing Japan as integral piece of the defense puzzle in Asia against communist incursion around the region. In 1950, a National Police Reserve of 75,000 strong was established largely to replace American troops that left for Korea and to resolve internal disputes and guard against communist subversion, a great worry during the latter half of the Occupation. While Japan did not contribute soldiers to the Korean War, it actually benefited from the production of material used to support the war effort, giving its economy a boost. By 1951, the Mutual Security Treaty between the United States and Japan was signed, placing Japan firmly under the defense umbrella of the United States in exchange for basing rights in Japan.³⁰ With the Self-Defense Forces Law of 1954, the remaining Police Reserve was termed the Self Defense Force and mandated the use of air, land and sea forces to protect the peace and security of the Japanese nation against direct and indirect aggression.³¹ In this manner, after only a few years of the imposition of Article 9, Japan began its somewhat contradictory maintenance of a military force at the behest of American policy makers.

The renegotiation of the Mutual Security Treaty in 1960, despite the political storminess of the debate beforehand gave Japan less of an unequal standing with the United States, as it represented a treaty between two nations instead of an occupied nation and its occupier. The “internal disturbance clause” which gave American troops freedom to act in the event of an externally motivated internal threat to Japanese security and the inability of Japan to grant a third power basing rights without the consent of the United States were both allowed to expire. On the other hand, a new “prior consultation” clause allowed more flexibility by allowing either Japan or the United States to initiate consultation when Japanese or Far East security is threatened or simply “from time to

²⁹ Constitution of Japan.

³⁰ Louis D. Hayes, *Introduction to Japanese Politics*, Armonk: East Gate, 2001, 290-291.

³¹ “Japan Defense Agency – Japan Self-Defense Force,” www.globalsecurity.org. [13 Mar 05].

time”.³² Further revision of the treaty in 1970 saw the negotiated reversions of many U.S. holdings back to Japan, including the controversial U.S. possession of Okinawa.

At the same time, there were also other changing dynamics in the U.S.-Japan relationship. Even as the United States sought to make Japan an economic bulwark against communism, in 1965, the Japanese started to experience a trade surplus with the United States. While Japan supported the United States war effort in Vietnam through basing rights and materials, they did not send any troops. Furthermore, the Guam Declaration by Nixon in 1969 that stated American allies should take it upon themselves to increase their share of the defense burden coupled with the Nixon visit to China in 1971 without Japanese consultation and the later American withdrawal from Vietnam led Japanese policy makers to reconsider complete reliance upon the United States for defense issues. The floating of the American dollar off the gold standard in 1971 and the ten percent surcharge on Japanese imports into America was also another shock.³³ Reflecting these changes, as well as statements such as those uttered by the American Secretary of Defense in 1975 that Japan was guilty of a mere “passive defense”, Japan began to shoulder more of the economic burden of its defense. The Guidelines for Japan-United States Defense Cooperation in 1978 also expanded the role of the Self-Defense Forces and the Japanese role in security issues to some extent.³⁴

The 1980s saw the close relationship between American president Ronald Reagan and Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone Yasuhiro, popularly termed the “Ron-Yasu” relationship. While not entirely successful in changing actual conditions, Nakasone took large steps to change the perspective on Japanese security policy. Statements openly referring to Japan as a “giant aircraft carrier”, expanding Japanese responsibility to sea-lanes within 1,000 nautical miles of Japan, and emphasizing a shift from “absolute minimal response capability” to a more substantial capability were all symbolic of the attitude change during his prime ministership. It was also under his watch that the traditional one percent of the GNP limit on military spending put in place by the Sato

³² J.A.A. Stockwin, *Governing Japan*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999, 208.

³³ Hayes, 267-268.

³⁴ Duncan McCargo, *Contemporary Japan*, 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave, 2004, 184.

administration was officially lifted.³⁵ Despite these gains, little actually changed from the trend of gradual expansion of the Japanese role in providing for their own defense.

The relationship between Japan and the United States during the Cold War can be summarized in three main stages. During the early Occupation, the United States wished Japan to have a very low international presence in security matters. However, after the Cold War really started to emerge, they began to pressure Japan to assume a large role both in economic and security terms. The 1970s saw an even further expansion of Japanese security efforts, both with the United States and without, largely through the notion of comprehensive security. Despite divergences over economic matters, the 1980s saw a resurgence of the U.S.-Japan security relationship during the “Ron-Yasu” period.

2. Japanese Notion of Comprehensive Security

Because of the limits on Japan’s ability to provide for its security in strictly military terms, Japan embraced a strategy that included political, economic and military dimensions in its concept of security, with most of the emphasis on economic measures. Seeking to quickly overcome the stigma associated with Japanese aggression during World War II, it sought quickly to negotiate reparation payments to countries in the region. Burma was paid in 1954, the Philippines in 1956, Indonesia in 1958, Laos and Cambodia in 1959, Thailand in 1962 and South Korea in 1965. Of important note, Japan was allowed to give these payments in goods and services rather than the initial proposals of divvying out Japan’s industrial base.³⁶ These were also attempts to promote a free trade system amenable to the Japanese economy as these reparations negotiations also included the establishment of formal trade relations. Another step towards improving relations with the rest of the world was the Tokyo Olympics in 1964, which apart from furthering Westernization in Japan, also served to promote goodwill and a more positive image of Japan in the world’s view.

After the “oil shocks” and the “Nixon shocks” in the 1970s, Japan sought to further expand its roles in foreign policy that were independent of the United States but not necessarily counter to U.S. interests. One excellent example of this is the efforts initiated by prime minister Fukuda in 1977 during a visit to Southeast Asia, proposing

³⁵ Stockwin, 64-65.

³⁶ W. G. Beasley, *The Rise of Modern Japan*, New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995, 64-65.

\$1.55 billion in economic assistance and the promotion of Japanese involvement in ASEAN activities. This was meant to satisfy the Japanese need for markets overseas and natural resources while helping the economic development of Southeast Asian countries. After the mid-1980s, Japan shifted emphasis from pure natural resources to manufacturing. By 1990, the Japanese share of foreign direct investment in countries like Indonesia and Thailand ranged between twenty-five and fifty percent. This kind of aid was a type of omni-directional foreign policy that sought to place the rest of Asia in a state of economic dependence and interdependence with Japan. More cynical analysts accused Japan of an economic neo-colonialism, noting that much of the Japanese efforts seemed similar to their previous vision of a Greater Asian Co-Prosperity Sphere.³⁷

The type of overseas development aid (ODA) given by Japan to other countries highlighted the focus of comprehensive security policy. Starting in the 1960s, Japan became a significant donor nation and with the Fukuda doctrine, made Japan the largest by 1989. However, instead of primarily giving large amounts of grants to very poor developing countries, many of the recipients were actually countries with relatively high living standards that could readily be converted into or have an expansion of the Japanese overseas market. Furthermore, the aid is often in the form of development loans instead of grants, giving Japan literal returns on investments.³⁸ This sort of pragmatic charity served to boost Japan's economy and international standing while still keeping a relatively low profile. Japan also claims that their heavy investment in the Asian region was a prime factor in defeating Cold War communism by spreading market practices and capital development.

3. Bilateral Relations with China and South Korea

Japanese relations with the People's Republic of China (PRC) and South Korea are important to understand because Japan's role in serving as the northern anchor in American Asian policy created a framework that influenced the development of relationships with these countries during the Cold War. The specific development with each country demonstrates the degrees of rigidity and flexibility that Japanese policy makers were able to exercise within this framework.

³⁷ McCargo, 191-193.

³⁸ Ibid., 198-199.

a. Sino-Japanese Relations

The communist nature of the PRC's government made formal ties with Japan an impossibility and early relations between the two took the form of economic agreements. When the San Francisco Peace Treaty was signed in 1951 which ended the U.S. occupation in 1952, Japan was pressured by the U.S. into signing a peace treaty with Taiwan. The bilateral Republic of China-Japan Treaty of 1952 announced the end of hostilities between Japan and China, and in effect, recognized Taipei as the official government of China. This affront to Beijing prompted a series of negotiations between Japan and the PRC that resulted in four "unofficial" trade agreements between the two countries during the 1950s. An important factor during these negotiations was the ability of the PRC to take advantage of some pro-Chinese sentiment within Japan. This trade was temporarily halted when the Chinese claimed a slight to the Chinese flag was committed at a Nagasaki trade fair in 1958. The trade did not resume until the 1960s at a somewhat higher level than before.³⁹

Although the Japanese notion of comprehensive security included political and economic aspects, the official government policy was to separate politics and economics, or *seikei bunri*. This enabled Japan to pursue economic agreements with as many countries as possible, including those on the "wrong" side of the Cold War. More specifically in China's case, unofficial trade agreements were acceptable as long as they did not imply political recognition of the PRC. However, the PRC refused to make this separation and continually antagonized trade negotiators who were occasionally forced to sign agreements that criticized the Japanese position regarding Taiwan. In 1970, Zhou Enlai announced several principles that discouraged firms operating in South Korea and Taiwan to conduct trade with China. The Sato administration in turn took a hard-line approach to the PRC, which was a source of discontent as opinion within Japan favored normalization.

The turning point and substantive beginning of relations between Japan and the PRC was Nixon's announcement of his trip to China in 1971 without any consultation with the Japanese. The Sato administration fell from power and was quickly replaced by the Tanaka administration, which openly sought relations with the PRC.

³⁹ Stockwin, 212.

Coupled with the broader foreign policy factors discussed previously, Japan pushed for more flexibility in political and economic relations. Consequently, in 1972, it broke off official ties with Taipei, issued a formal apology for damages to China before 1945, and declared that it “fully understood and respected” Beijing’s position on Taiwan. In return, China waived reparations, did not require Japan to cease informal relations with Taiwan, nor did it try to force a Japanese withdrawal from the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty.⁴⁰

Within three years, trade between Japan and China tripled to where it amounted to one-fourth of China’s trade. As evidence of Japan’s omni-directional policy largely in pursuit of economic relations, Japan still continued its trade with Taiwan. In 1978, the Sino-Japanese Treaty of Peace and Friendship and the Sino-Japanese Long Term Trade Agreement further increased trade relations between the two, which were not without starts and stops or losses due to political trouble within China. The timing of these agreements immediately preceded the start of Deng Xiaoping’s implementation of more open, market-oriented policies. The expansion of trade continued through the 1980s before being reduced briefly after the harsh crackdown in Tiananmen Square in 1989.⁴¹ As with most nations in the region, Japan still has to deal with legacies from World War Two in its relations with the PRC. One notable example of this has been controversy over textbooks used in Japanese schools that downplayed the aggressive actions of Japanese military forces in the 1930s and 1940s. Japan’s Ministry of Education drew harsh criticism in 1982 and 1986 from the PRC and South Korea and this issue remains sensitive even in the present.⁴²

In short, Japanese Cold War relations with the PRC may be explained by two major features of overall Japanese Cold War policy. All throughout the Cold War, Japan attempted to promote economic ties, showing the commitment to the expansion of economic interdependence throughout Asia and the growth of Japanese overseas markets. Politically, Japan was restricted from operating in an official diplomatic capacity until the United States openly established relations with the PRC in the 1970s. It was not until

⁴⁰ Ibid., 212.

⁴¹ Hayes, 259-260.

⁴² Beasley, 276.

after Japan began its pursuit of an engagement policy independent from that of the United States that Japan-PRC relations became official.

b. Bilateral Relations with South Korea

Due to the legacies of Japanese colonial rule over Korea ending in 1945, relations between Japan and South Korea have been strained at best. Despite strong U.S. pressures, it was not until the overthrow of Korean President Rhee Syngman in 1960 that normalization was able to develop, primarily due to Rhee's firm anti-Japanese stance. His eventual successor Park Chung-Hee looked to Japan as a source of economic growth which was necessary for his regime's legitimacy.⁴³ Consequently, after agreeing to reinstate talks in the early 1960s, the two countries signed the Korea-Japan Basic Treaty in 1965, which amongst other things included reparations payments to Korea. By this time, economic relations were also in full swing, as Japan began to contribute a sizable percentage of foreign capital investment for successive Korean Five Year Plans starting in 1962.⁴⁴

Another factor contributing to the early growth of South Korean-Japan relations was Japanese Prime Minister Sato's strong pro-South Korean sentiment. His anti-PRC stance hindered relations with China during this period, but it served to strengthen ties between South Korea and Japan. In line with the Japanese policy of *seikei bunri*, Japan still maintained the trade with North Korea which began as early as 1955. However, this trade was not allowed to expand to the level of the trade with South Korea and meetings were strictly limited. Despite a sizable pro-North Korean contingent among Koreans living in Japan, the Sato administration was adamantly against recognition of the North Korean government. An understanding that Japan and South Korea were part of a necessary framework in the U.S. security picture in Northeast Asia made relations easier to develop. South Korea viewed American bases in Japan, particularly on Okinawa as an important deterrence to a North Korean attack. To facilitate these relations, annual ministerial conferences, which were held alternately in

⁴³ Stockwin, 213.

⁴⁴ Hahn Bae-ho, "Korea-Japan Relations in the 1970s," *Asian Survey* 20, No. 11 (Nov., 1980): 1088-1089.

Tokyo and Seoul, the Korea-Japan Cooperation Committee, and the Korean-Japanese Economic Cooperation Committee were established.⁴⁵

However, these relations were no exception to the changing dynamics in the 1970s that affected most of Japan's foreign relations. Zhou Enlai's announcement of the "principles" that made it difficult for Japanese firms that operated in either Taiwan or South Korea to conduct operations in China resulted in many of these firms closing shop in South Korea. The Nixon shocks and the new Tanaka administration's opening of relations with China strained relations with the South Koreans concerned with the implications of a China-friendly Japan. To make matters worse, there were two highly contentious issues that made relations especially rocky: the abduction of the Korean opposition leader Kim Dae Jung in 1973 and the assassination attempt on Park Chung-Hee in 1974. Kim Dae Jung's abduction occurred when he was in Tokyo and was considered a violation of Japanese sovereignty. Despite initial denials of involvement, the Korean government later admitted the role of the KCIA in the incident. After a brief settlement of this issue, there was an assassination attempt on Park Chung-Hee the next year which ended up in the death of his wife by a Korean resident of Japan. The South Korean government demanded an official apology from Japan for not stopping the incident, but the Japanese government would not assume any responsibility for the event.⁴⁶ Relations would stabilize afterwards, but the relative closeness of the Sato administration would not return. As part of efforts to revitalize ties with the United States in the 1980s, Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone made overtures towards South Korea. South Korea's gradual transition towards democracy also enabled relations to strengthen during this period. As with China, there are colonial legacies of the Second World War that markedly set the tone for Japan-South Korea relations, including the previously mentioned textbook controversy in the 1980s.⁴⁷

Japanese-South Korean relations during the Cold War can be summarized by four main stages: initial distance during the Rhee Syngman period, rapprochement

⁴⁵ Ibid., 1089.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 1089-1094.

⁴⁷ Stockwin, 213.

during the Park and Sato administrations, strain during the 1970s, and guarded ties thereafter.

4. Summary of Japanese Cold War Relations

The conduct of Japanese security policy during the Cold War is a combination of their broad notion of comprehensive security and their close involvement with the United States. Initially, Japan strictly followed the political orbit of the United States in their diplomatic dealings with other countries, although their policy of *Seikei Bunri* allowed them to deal economically with a wide number of nations. After the Nixon shocks in the 1970s, Japan sought to expand its independent role in policy apart from the United States and began to engage countries like China. As the Japanese economy grew and expanded, they also invested heavily in the Asian region to create markets and prop up regional development, which was later cited as the economic battlefield against communism. Towards the end of the Cold War, Japan revitalized its relationship with the United States even as it continued its low key pursuit of economic leadership.

B. JAPANESE POST-COLD WAR RELATIONS

Japanese post-Cold War Relations have taken a much more active and overtly multi-lateral tone than the majority of the Cold War period. Bilateral relations with the United States and other countries were still a major factor, but in the latter stages of the Cold War, Japan began to seek positions of international leadership in more than economic terms. After the Cold War ended, the primary threat of Soviet expansion was now over and renewed questioning of where the U.S.-Japan security relationship was headed. In the post-Cold War era, the most important security dilemma facing Japan is the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula with possible conflict between China and Taiwan following behind. Prime Minister Koizumi's commitment to close ties with the United States, tested and proven after the terrorist attacks against the United States in 2001, ensure that however independent a role Japan may seek for itself, the United States will still remain an important factor in influencing any decision Japan makes in the near future.

1. U.S.-Japan Relations

The end of the Cold War and the Soviet threat caused many to re-examine the nature of the U.S.-Japan security relationship. What shaped Japan-U.S. relations in the

early 1990s was Japan's response to the First Gulf War. The response of the Kaifu administration was quick to condemn the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in August of 1990 and even entertained the idea of sending minesweepers to the area, although public opinion and the interpretation of the legal framework at the time made this option infeasible. Japan ended up sending \$13 billion in aid to coalition forces, several times their initial proposition and banned imports of Iraqi oil. However, just as important was what they did not do: send troops.⁴⁸ International opinion, especially in the United States, criticized Japanese "checkbook diplomacy." This caused a shift in Japanese opinion towards a more active role internationally, including peacekeeping operations. But with regards to Japan-U.S. relations, it was a disappointing episode for both sides.

The next major security issue involving both Japan and the United States was North Korea's threatening to withdraw from the Non-Proliferation Treaty and gain nuclear weapons, a theme that still exists today. Japan was acutely aware of its earlier failure during the Gulf War, but was wary about imposing full sanctions against the North Koreans, which was an option the United States was pursuing in the UN Security Council. Japan was, and still is, unable to completely enforce a full cutoff of all remittances to North Korea from Koreans in Japan, considering the many illegal methods of transfer used, and any attempt to do so would bring about massive disorder from the pro-Pyongyang residents in Japan. This incident also highlighted the stringent restrictions on the actions of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces overseas, as Japan was technically unable to perform many of the tasks requested by the United States should a crisis arise. Part of the fallout of this episode was a call for reviewing the guidelines for U.S.-Japan military cooperation.⁴⁹

The Clinton administration caused anxiety over the level of U.S. commitment to Japanese security given President Clinton's overt policy of increasing U.S.-PRC relations. In partial recognition of this, President Clinton and Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto reaffirmed the security relationship between the two countries and set about a reevaluation of the defense guidelines in 1996. The new U.S.-Japan Defense Guidelines were completed a year later, reflecting concerns over the post-Cold War situation, to

⁴⁸ Stockwin, 75-78.

⁴⁹ Don Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, Indianapolis: Basic, 2001, 319.

include the impact of the Gulf War, possible nuclearization of the Korean peninsula, and China's rising presence in Asia.⁵⁰ The new guidelines include cooperation measures such as broadened acknowledgement of various normal and peacetime operations to include disaster relief, peace keeping operations, humanitarian operations and more information sharing. It also dealt with principles regarding an attack against Japan itself, giving Japan primary responsibility to deal with internal matters. Even more importantly, it dealt with events or crises not just in Japan, but also in "surrounding areas," which broadens the definition of the traditional bare minimum for defense capability.⁵¹

The next and current major stage of Japan-U.S. relations is the Global War on Terrorism initiated after the September 11th terrorist attacks against the United States. Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi's immediate support for the United States demonstrated his commitment to U.S.-Japan relations was more than simply a statement. The subsequent Anti-Terrorism Special Measures law passed in 2001 and the modification of the International Peace Cooperation Law gave the Japanese Self-Defense Forces an expanded role and capability, especially in coordination with the U.S.⁵² Reflecting this, Japan deployed troops to support the U.S. efforts both in Afghanistan and Iraq, the latter being even more significant because it is not directly under a UN auspice. Troop deployment to Iraq was also important because it seemed to directly make up for what they did not do over a decade earlier in the first Gulf War: provide troops on the ground.

The other main issue of U.S.-Japanese cooperation is the six-party talks over the North Korean nuclearization issue. In 1998, a Taepodong missile launch that saw North Korea shooting what it claims to have been a satellite fell over 1,000 miles away, flying over and past Japan. Part of the resultant panic and furor elicited by this action was the establishment of the Trilateral Coordination and Oversight Group (TCOG) composed of the United States, Korea and Japan to deal specifically with the North Korean issue.⁵³ This still remains as a tool to try and coordinate policy between the three countries,

⁵⁰ Hayes, 292.

⁵¹ Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation, U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee release, http://www.fas.org/news/japan/97092302_epo.html. [12 Dec 04]

⁵² Paul Midford, "Japan's Response to Terror," *Asian Survey* 43, no. 2 (Mar/Apr 2003): 332-333.

⁵³ Oberdorfer, 410-419.

although Japan seems much more interested in maintaining a status-quo. Any disruption, whether a disastrous downturn of events leading to violence or even a peaceful unification, is bound to have temporarily negative effects on the regional economy. More cynically, a unified Korea could also provide an economic competitor in the future. Japan's current hard-line stance on the North Korean issue, compounded by the recent uproar with media and governmental emphasis on the abduction of Japanese citizens during the 1970s and 1980s, falls somewhat in line with Washington. Tensions resulting from North Korea's recent actions have increased Japan's willingness to increase its security capabilities, including the implementation of a ballistic missile defense system in the near future in cooperation with the United States.⁵⁴

2. Japanese Multilateral Relations

Large efforts for a Japanese role within multilateral organizations began during the Cold War, but it was not until after the Cold War that Japan began to seek more than economic influence. Vehicles for Japanese multilateral efforts include the United Nations, the Asian Pacific Economic Council (APEC), and ASEAN. The largely economic nature of most of these associations points to the lack of solidly effective regional cooperation efforts beyond primarily economic terms and the more effective economic leverage of Japan.

a. United Nations

Japan's active pursuit of a role in the UN actually began in the mid-1980s, including funding and more Japanese personnel working within the UN. More relevant to security concerns were the Japanese proposals for increased UN involvement in peacekeeping operations all around the world. In 1988 and 1989, Japan became the second and third largest contributor to the UN agencies overall and in peacekeeping operations, respectively. In regional terms, they wished to address conflict in Cambodia through the United Nations and were part of humanitarian aid efforts to many Indo-Chinese.⁵⁵ This reflected early efforts to make Japan more visible in the international arena outside of U.S. security policy.

⁵⁴ Michael H. Armacost, "Japan: Tilting Closer to Washington," *Strategic Asia 2003-2004: Fragility and Crisis*, Seattle: National Bureau of Asian Research, 2003, 87-91.

⁵⁵ Tsuneo Akaha, "Japan's Comprehensive Security Policy: A New East Asian Environment," *Asian Survey* 31, No. 4 (Apr., 1991): 328-329.

The profound shift in Japan's approach to the United Nations came after the First Persian Gulf War and after being criticized for conducting "checkbook diplomacy." At the time, Japan was aiming for a permanent seat on the Security Council. International criticism questioned the validity of Japan's claim in light of its inability to contribute manpower to areas of crisis. According to a Ministry of Foreign Affairs paper, "This stinging criticism brought home to their minds the importance of sharing the burden with blood, sweat and tears, and not just with money, as a responsible member of the international community striving for the common cause of maintaining peace with justice."⁵⁶ Less poetically, it demonstrated to Japan that if their quest for a permanent seat on the Security Council were to be successful, they could not limit themselves solely to financial support in the international arena.

With increased public opinion and policy maker backing, Japan passed legal measures making it lawful under strict circumstances for Japanese SDF forces to participate in peacekeeping operations overseas. Starting in 1992, Japan began deployments largely under UN auspices around the world in places such as Cambodia, Mozambique, Zaire, Tanzania, the Golan Heights, East Timor, Afghanistan and Iraq.⁵⁷ With each successive deployment, restrictions have been eased and capabilities gradually expanded, whether in practice, modifications to old laws or the passage of new laws. To ease fears over possible future Japanese militarization, change has been gradual and resulted in a relatively positive image of Japan's more active role internationally.

b. Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation

The Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation organization was founded in 1989 and is currently composed of 21 member nations. As its name implies, it is meant to promote free trade within the Asia Pacific region. It has no binding commitments, and any commitments are strictly voluntary.⁵⁸ Consequently, the effectiveness of this organization is rather limited. It was primarily started to prevent an exclusively Asian economic bloc, and the opportunities for Japan to pursue a strong leadership role are

⁵⁶ MOFA, Japan, Current Issues Surrounding UN Peace-keeping Operations and Japanese Perspective, January 1997, <<http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/pko/issues.html>>. [16 Mar 05]

⁵⁷ "UN Peacekeeping Operations," Ministry of Foreign Affairs Japan, <http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/pamph2000/pko.html>. [16 Mar 05]

⁵⁸ "About APEC," Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation, <http://www.apec.org/apec/about_apec.html> [23 Mar 05].

rather limited. Many Asian countries were also dissatisfied with U.S. pressure to open up politically sensitive sectors of the regional economy, its redundancy with other organizations like the World Trade Organization or the ASEAN Regional Forum, a lack of firm structure or narrower specific goals of common interest throughout the entire, broad membership. Disillusionment was furthered during the Asian Financial Crisis in 1997, which motivated the seeking of other alternatives.⁵⁹

c. Association of Southeast Asian Nations

In line with its policy of international engagement, Japan increased its involvement with ASEAN during the 1990s. Cooperation with ASEAN was facilitated by years of active participation and the perception that Japan could offer alternatives to U.S. diplomatic pressures for the region. Japan expressed serious interest in creating more regional security dialogues, proposing the ASEAN-Prime Ministerial Conference serve such a purpose. While this was rejected, Japanese Foreign Minister Nakayama revamped a proposal which was also rejected, but later realized in the establishment of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) in the first half of the 1990s.⁶⁰

The self-stated objectives of ARF are to “foster constructive dialogue and consultation on political and security issues of common interest and concern” and “to make significant contributions to efforts towards confidence building and preventive diplomacy in the Asia-Pacific region.”⁶¹ ARF has a broad membership composed of 24 nations, including the ASEAN nations, Japan, China, the Koreas, the United States, Russia and others. Part of the Japanese attraction to ARF and ASEAN is the difficulty of creating a Northeast Asian cooperation organization, due to past and present tension in the area. ARF has been involved in discussing the nuclear confrontation on the Korean peninsula, an item of extreme importance to the Japanese, but it is unlikely to produce any concrete results. However, the dialogue within ARF has proven useful in promoting some institutionalization of Asian multilateralism.⁶²

⁵⁹ Naoko Munakata “Whither East Asian Economic Integration?” Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies, Brookings Institution: 2002, 9-12.

⁶⁰ Akiko Fukushima, “Japan’s Emerging View of Security Multilateralism in Asia,” Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, University of California: 1999, 27-29.

⁶¹ “ASEAN Regional Forum,” ASEAN, <<http://www.aseansec.org/arf.htm>>. [21 Mar 2005]

⁶² Sheldon Simon, “Whither Security Regionalism?” Strategic Asia 2003-2004: Fragility and Crisis, Seattle: National Bureau of Asian Research, 2003, 275-279.

Another outgrowth of ASEAN that Japan participates in is the more narrowly focused ASEAN + 3, the other two included nations being China and South Korea. ASEAN + 3 was created largely as a result of dissatisfaction with the “Washington Consensus” and the performance of the International Monetary Fund during the Asian Financial Crisis in 1997. The crisis also highlighted how linked many Asian countries were in terms of economic vulnerability, furthering the need for a more Asia-centered economic forum. This reflected concerns stemming from a perception that United States involvement via the APEC was neither always necessary nor desired. As with many ASEAN outgrowth organizations, it demonstrates the attractiveness of a firmly established Asian multilateral organization to East Asian countries, which they can use to discuss their own agendas and possibly establish a regional dialogue of their own. While it is primarily an organ for economic cooperation, anything promoting interdependence is advantageous in fulfilling the Japanese notion of comprehensive security. Japan hopes to pursue a role of leadership in ASEAN + 3 to promote this, if not merely to prevent China from doing so.⁶³

3. Summary of Japanese Post-Cold War Relations

From observing Japan’s most important bilateral relationship, the United States, and several Japanese ventures in multilateralism, there can be several trends identified in Japanese security policies in the post-Cold War period. The first is, despite the existence of doubts about whether the United States can or will provide for the security of Japan, the relationship between the two countries remains first and foremost responsible for matters of military security. The second is Japan has undergone a significant shift in perspective regarding its role in the international community. No longer content with pursuing silent economic leadership, it is also actively engaged in matters of international security. Using both cooperation with the United Nations and the United States as momentum for change, it has expanded the roles and capabilities of the Self Defense Forces to meet this new role. At the same time, any meaningful multilateralism efforts on the part of Japan, especially in the Northeast Asian region, usually depend upon partnership with either the United States or as outgrowths of already established international or regional organizations such as the United Nations or ASEAN. This

⁶³ Munakata, 12-14.

points to the difficulty of establishing regional cohesion in Northeast Asia even in economic terms, let alone security. As such, despite Japan's change in perspective towards its international role, any such leadership for the time being will still primarily be economic or interdependent with other existing organizations rather than a specifically regionally-based Northeast Asian security organization.

C. TRENDS AND SUMMARY

The conduct of Japanese security policy after World War II has had several stages of development over the years. The early years saw Japan limited mainly to economic recovery and relying very heavily upon the United States for its security. While such reliance has not yet disappeared, Japan's economic growth led it to pursue a role of economic leadership in the development of many Asian countries, primarily those it saw as potential markets. After the Nixon shocks in the 1970s, Japan, as many other Asian countries did, started to pursue a foreign security policy of engagement independent of but not necessarily counter to American interests in the region. Japan's notion of comprehensive security is the most significant trait of its security policy, viewing national security in terms of economic, political and military terms. Seeking regional interdependence, Japan sought more participation in multilateral organizations as the Cold War drew to a close and after, especially following the failure of "checkbook diplomacy" in the First Gulf War. Of particular note is the expansion of the role of the Japanese Self Defense Forces in tandem with increased participation in United Nations peacekeeping operations and U.S.-Japan cooperation efforts. While Japan seeks a more independent role for itself in international relations and regional security, it still preserves a close relationship with the United States, as evidenced by heavy support for the Global War on Terrorism. In the future, Japan will most likely continue its increased engagement in regional economic and security forums while still maintaining its relationship with the United States.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

IV. BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE DEBATE

The security environment in Northeast Asia exacerbated by North Korea's pursuit of nuclear weapons and developing missile programs has highlighted the issue of a ballistic missile defense (BMD). For Japan, participation in a theater missile defense (TMD) designed to protect American forces and allies overseas is an option to mitigate the destruction and loss of life should hostilities emerge on the peninsula and China's rapidly expanding missile capabilities serve as a reminder of Japan's vulnerability. Background on the North Korean nuclear crisis and current missile capabilities, China's missile capabilities and the evolution of the TMD debate within Japan will be evaluated.

A. NORTH KOREAN NUCLEAR CRISIS

North Korea's nuclear and missile programs have been issues of serious concern in Japan. Understanding the development of the security situation on the Korean Peninsula adds necessary context to the debate over TMD in Japan.

In 1989, concern in the newly elected George H. W. Bush administration over reports of a possible North Korean nuclear program the intelligence community had been tracking for several years began to spread. North Korea responded with hostility to accusations and stated it would not allow inspectors while American nuclear weapons remained on the Korean peninsula, which were later withdrawn in conjunction with a wider move to remove all ground-based and sea-based tactical nuclear weapons from forward deployed positions world-wide.⁶⁴ The following dialogue allowed by this action resulted in a joint declaration in 1991 entitled the North-South Basic Agreement on Reconciliation and Non-aggression. This stated both Koreas recognized the other, would work towards a peaceful relationship and was accompanied by an accord on the nuclear issue. This agreement was important symbolically, if not realistically, and allowed for more open exchanges between the two Koreas.⁶⁵

What followed were two years of unsuccessful negotiations regarding the issue. North Korea confounded IAEA inspectors' efforts to determine compliance, suspended

⁶⁴ Don Oberdorfer, *The Two Koreas*, New York: Basic, 2001, 259-260.

⁶⁵ Cha, "Realism, Liberalism, and the Durability of the U.S.-South Korean Alliance," 616.

the Non-Proliferation Treaty and defied threats to have sanctions imposed. They were declared in non-compliance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty after withdrawing 8,000 spent fuel rods from the reactor in Yongbyon and did not allow the IAEA to verify their history. In the meantime, South Korea elected a new president in 1992, Kim Young Sam, who did not favor over-engagement with North Korea. Tensions increased with all parties involved, with many fearing the outbreak of a full-scale war.⁶⁶ A temporary resolution was brought about by the 1994 Agreed Framework. Kim Il Sung agreed to “freeze” his nuclear program and allow the weapons inspectors in Yongbyon to stay. In return, the United States would support a plan to build two light water reactors, funded and headed primarily by South Korea with United States technology, provide North Korea with heavy oil shipments to compensate it for lost energy, and work towards closer diplomatic relations with North Korea.⁶⁷

Japan was acutely aware of its earlier failure during the Gulf War, but was wary about imposing full sanctions against the North Koreans, which was an option the United States was pursuing in the UN Security Council. Complicating the issue was North Korea’s successful testing of a Nodong missile into the Sea of Japan, demonstrating their ability to strike western areas of Japan.⁶⁸ Japan was and still is unable to completely enforce a full cutoff of all remittances, estimated to be \$600 million annually at the time, to North Korea from Koreans in Japan considering the many illegal methods of transfer used and any attempt to do so would bring about massive disorder from the pro-Pyongyang residents in Japan.⁶⁹ This incident also highlighted the stringent restrictions on the actions of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces overseas, as Japan was technically unable to perform many of the tasks requested by the United States should a crisis arise, the list of needed functions nearing almost 2,000 items. Of particular concern was Japan’s inability to rescue its own estimated 9,000 foreign nationals on the Korean Peninsula let alone other foreign nationals. In addition, Japan was unable even to

⁶⁶ Ibid., 616.

⁶⁷ Oberdorfer, 326-336.

⁶⁸ James Przystup, “China, Japan and the United States,” *The U.S.-Japan Alliance: Past, Present and Future*, ed. by Michael J. Green and Patrick M. Cronin, New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1999, 36.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 319.

promise the use of hospitals for any soldiers wounded in possible hostilities. Part of the fallout of this episode which highlighted the lack of contingency arrangements between the United States and Japan regarding Korea was a call for reviewing the guidelines for U.S.-Japan military cooperation under the Nye initiative.⁷⁰

The election of Kim Dae Jung to the South Korean presidency reflected a shift in opinion by the time he came to office in 1998. Due to the increased contact between the two Koreas and several natural disasters giving South Korea an opportunity to send aid, many people saw North Korea as less of a threat and more of a country needing help. This attitude towards more engagement and conciliation was embodied in Kim Dae Jung's "Sunshine Policy" which peaked in a summit meeting between Kim Dae Jung and Kim Jong Il in June of 2000. This alignment of policy between the United States under Clinton and South Korea under Kim led to a relaxing of some of the tensions which developed between the two over their approaches to dealing with North Korea.⁷¹

During this period, North Korea was not without incident, as in 1998, North Korea launched a Taepodong missile well over Japan and into the Pacific Ocean. Pyongyang claimed it was launching a satellite in space to broadcast revolutionary songs in honor of Kim Il Sung and Kim Jong Il. Whatever the motivation, it demonstrated to the United States, Japan and South Korea that North Korean missile technology was advancing at a rapid pace. This occurred only shortly after intelligence reports revealed what could possibly be an underground nuclear weapons complex in violation of the 1994 Agreed Framework.⁷² Japan's initial response was telling. Prime Minister Obuchi planned on suspending Japanese support for KEDO although United States pressure was sufficient in persuading him to resume. He also made the decision to develop and deploy a spy satellite system independent of the United States to monitor developments on the Korean Peninsula and the rest of the region. Japanese public response provided enough

⁷⁰ Funabashi Yoichi, *Alliance Adrift*, New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press: 1999, 281-293.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 18-19.

⁷² Oberdorfer, 410.

momentum to drive more support for the debate over participation in a theater missile defense (TMD), demonstrating the impetus crisis situations have on Japanese policy.⁷³

Part of the United States response was to commission former Secretary of Defense William Perry to address the issue. His first action was to form the Trilateral Coordination and Oversight Group (TCOG), composed of the United States, Japan and South Korea, in order to form a unified front on the issue. Perry proposed to the North Koreans a vision of full diplomatic and economic relations with the United States provided they gave up their missile and nuclear programs. Recognizing any full-scale change would be difficult, he suggested small step-by-step measures by either country, which were started by the United States by easing most economic restrictions in return for a North Korean moratorium on missile testing. The underground facility was also investigated by the U.S. in return for U.S. energy and monetary concessions.⁷⁴

The most recent North Korean nuclear crisis, or realistically, the latest episode of the same series, was directly brought about during a visit by the U.S. Assistant Secretary of State James Kelly to Pyongyang in October 2002. The North Koreans openly admitted to possessing a uranium enrichment program after accusations it was not upholding its end of the bargain formed by various commitments over the years. This was followed by the expulsion of IAEA inspectors from Yongbyon, a declaration it would re-activate the facility, and an announced withdrawal from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.⁷⁵ Since then, North Korea has withdrawn from its moratorium on missile testing and the Yongbyon facility has started and halted, implying fuel rod extraction for nuclear weapons purposes.

The American response was firm in demanding North Korea give up its nuclear program. As part of its efforts to pressure North Korea to do so, Beijing established a multilateral framework entitled the “Six Party Talks”, including the United States, Japan, South Korea, China, Russia and North Korea. Part of Washington’s strategy is to use the existing TCOG from the Clinton administration to try and coordinate efforts in these

⁷³ Thomas Berger, “Japan’s International Relations: The Political and Security Dimensions,” *The International Relations of Northeast Asia*, ed. by Samuel S. Kim, Oxford: Rowman, 2004, 150-151.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 418-423.

⁷⁵ *Asia Pacific Security Outlook 2004*, ed. Charles E. Morrison, Asia Pacific Agenda Project, Tokyo: Japan Center for International Exchange, 2004, 24.

talks. Despite North Korea's acceptance of this proposal, the first round of talks in August 2003 held in Beijing went nowhere, as the United States refused bilateral relations with North Korea or a nonaggression treaty despite South Korean encouragement and North Korea refused to give any concessions otherwise. The United States is attempting to push China towards a large role in mediating the crisis and hopes the softer approach afforded by its allies South Korea and Japan can also convince North Korea to give up its program.⁷⁶

Japan's pursuit of greater capabilities increases as time progresses. It deployed two reconnaissance satellites, increased moves to acquire Patriot missile defense systems, deployed naval forces to the Sea of Japan and ratified Emergency Law legislation expanding the ability to act during a military contingency.⁷⁷ Plans were made to have a constellation of four satellites to ensure 24-hour surveillance of North Korea, but a rocket carrying the latter two was destroyed after engine trouble was detected.⁷⁸ The second and third rounds of Six Party Talks have also proved fruitless as neither Washington nor Pyongyang is willing to give ground on their main demands. In February of 2005, North Korea publicly announced it possessed nuclear weapons and ended its moratorium on missile testing a month later.⁷⁹ Amidst repeated statements it is willing to return to the Six Party Talks, Pyongyang nevertheless warns it possesses even nuclear weapons to deter any United States attack.⁸⁰

In July 2005, North Korea announced its willingness to resume talks and the fourth round of negotiations begin. Some attribute this to a willingness on the part of the Bush administration to engage in direct talks with North Korea and a change in personnel.⁸¹ Talks were conducted from 28 July until 7 August when a vote for a recess

⁷⁶ Ibid., 25-30.

⁷⁷ Berger, 151.

⁷⁸ "Rockets Carrying Spy Satellites Destroyed," Mainichi Interactive <<http://www12.mainichi.co.jp/news/mdn/search-news/932447/north20korea20missile-0-4.html>> accessed 15 June 2005.

⁷⁹ "Timeline: N. Korea Nuclear Dispute," CNN Online <<http://www.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/asiapcf/02/10/nkorea.timeline/index.html>> accessed 15 June 2005.

⁸⁰ "Bouei ni Juubun na Kakuho yuu," Yomiuri Online <http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/features/hanto/200506/mi20050609_41.htm> accessed 15 June 2005.

⁸¹ Don Oberdorfer, "North Korea: Six-Party Talks Continue" Washington Post transcript from online discussion, 28 July 2005 <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/discussion/2005/07/27/DI2005072701759.html>> accessed 28 August 2005.

was passed. South Korean Foreign Minister Ban Ki-moon stated his belief that North Korea may be willing to give up its nuclear weapons program. The current United States proposal does not allow for North Korea to pursue a nuclear energy program and North Korea denies United States claims that North Korea is also pursuing a uranium nuclear program in addition to a plutonium program.⁸² Although talks were planned to resume the first week in September, they were delayed until mid-September instead.⁸³ The current tension between Pyongyang's insistence on a right to develop and maintain a peaceful nuclear program and Washington's stance that North Korea has lost this right due to flagrant and frequent violations in the past.⁸⁴ Fundamental disagreement on this issue means further talks in the months ahead will prove fruitless in the absence of a strong playing card, such as a missile defense undercutting North Korea's threat potential.

B. NORTH KOREA'S BALLISTIC MISSILE CAPABILITIES

Hand-in-hand with the North Korean nuclear development issue is the threat posed by North Korea's ballistic missile capabilities. The exact status of North Korea's missile program is not clear due to lack of information and Pyongyang's unwillingness to open up to the international community. What follows is a brief description of North Korea's ballistic missile inventory and capabilities.

1. Hwasong 5, 6/ "Scud B, C"

It is believed North Korea received its first Scud missiles from Egypt either in the latter half of the 1970s or in the early 1980s. The Scud B is a primitive single-stage, Soviet-designed liquid rocket with a range of approximately 300 km and formed the basis of North Korean reverse-engineering efforts. The Hwasong 5 is the domestically produced version with a range of 330 km and a payload of approximately 1,000 kg. The Hwasong 6 or "Scud C" missile is the result of an attempt to upgrade the Scud C basic design and full-scale production began in the early 1990s. With a range of 500 km, it

⁸² "S. Korea: Pyongyang may compromise," CNN Online 22 August 2005 <<http://www.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/asiapcf/08/21/us.korea.nuclear.ap/index.html>> accessed 28 August 2005.

⁸³ "Report: Nuke talks to be delayed," CNN Online 28 August 2005 <<http://www.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/asiapcf/08/28/nkorea.talks.ap/index.html>> accessed 28 August 2005.

⁸⁴ "NK: Right to peaceful nuke program," CNN Online 13 September 2005 <<http://www.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/asiapcf/09/13/korea.nuclear/index.html>> accessed 13 September 2005.

features a smaller payload of around 500 to 700 kg with a longer length to facilitate extra distance capability. Together, the various Scud missiles in North Korea are estimated to number over 500 and are capable of carrying either a high explosive or chemical warhead. Their range allows coverage of any location in South Korea. The estimated numbers of Scud launch platforms is between 25 and 30.⁸⁵

2. Nodong I

The Nodong missile began as an even further modification of the Scud B missile in 1988. In 1993, it was a Nodong prototype missile tested during the showdown over North Korea's nuclear program. Despite the missile program being plagued with problems, the Nodong missile reached deployment capability sometime in the late 1990s. The single stage, liquid-fueled rocket can carry either a high explosive or chemical warhead payload of around 1,000 kg for an estimated range of around 1,000 to 1,300 km. Despite North Korean claims, it is unlikely they possess the ability to mount a nuclear warhead successfully. However, this still allows Pyongyang to target nearly any of the Japanese islands and represents a grave threat to Japanese security. The Circular Error Probability (CEP), or the range to the target the missile will fall 50% of the time is between one and four kilometers. All performance data for the Nodong is derived from Pakistani and Iranian missile testing which has connections to North Korea. The number of Nodong I missiles in North Korea's inventory is estimated to be over 100.⁸⁶

3. Nodong B

The Nodong B is an informal classification for a new missile in development in North Korea. Reports in September 2003 indicated the workings of liquid-fueled rocket similar to the Soviet SS-N-6 yet with a range between 2,750 km and 4,000 km. This expanded range could be used to strike American forces on Okinawa or Guam, posing a challenge to America's security umbrella over Japan. The original SS-N-6 was intended to be fired from a submarine, although there is a possibility it could be modified to be launched from a small boat.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ "Missiles – North Korea Special Weapons," <www.globalsecurity.org> accessed 15 June 2005.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

4. Taepodong I, II

Sometimes referred to as Nodong II, The Taepodong I consists of a modified Nodong I missile as its first stage, a Hwasong 5 or 6 Scud missile as its second stage and an attached warhead. The missile test flight on 31 August 1998 which landed in the ocean after flying over Japan was the first and only test flight of the Taepodong I. While unsuccessful, it is believed it will undergo testing in Iran and Pakistan similar to their variants of the Nodong I. The dual stage Taepodong I has an estimated range of approximately 2000 km, gaining an extra 800 km with the addition of another stage. The payload is approximately 1,000 kg and may have the ability to carry nuclear weaponry. Continual problems hinder the fielding of this system.

The Taepodong II is dual or triple stage rocket possibly based on the Taepodong I. With a projected range between 3,750 and 6,000 km, it is North Korea's attempt at developing an Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM). It is still deep in development with engine tests being the highest possible advancement stage. Consequently, it is unlikely North Korea will develop the necessary missile technology to mount WMD on such a missile in the near future, yet it poses a potential danger in being able to reach the United States.⁸⁸

5. North Korean Missile Threat Summary

North Korea's missile program is still plagued by technological barriers hindering its development. Despite rather primitive guidance systems, it has the ability to devastate South Korea and once fully capable, over 100 medium range missiles can strike locations in Japan should hostilities arise. While much attention is focused on North Korea's nuclear efforts, a chemical or high explosive warhead would still cause much damage and loss of life if it landed in Japan.

C. CHINA'S THEATER MISSILE CAPABILITIES

China's missile program is far more developed than North Korea's. It possesses nuclear-tipped ICBM's capable of reaching targets in the United States. Beijing's medium and short range missiles capable of reaching Japan are fully developed and deployed. China insists its increase in missile development is aimed at gaining a minimum deterrence capability against adversaries equipped with larger arsenals and

⁸⁸ Ibid.

more advanced technology rather than aggressive arms buildup.⁸⁹ However, China has a history of fully implementing dual-use advances into its military program. The following is a brief summary of China's theater ballistic missile force.

1. DF-11

The DF-11 is the Chinese version of the basic single stage Scud missile employing solid rocket fuel with a range of 300 km. It is noticeably much more accurate with a CEP of 200 meters and can carry either a conventional high explosive warhead or up to a 350 kiloton (kt) nuclear warhead. Plans are currently underway to develop an extended range version of this missile with an updated guidance system using global positioning systems (GPS) to provide better target data. As of 1995 there were over 40 of these deployed with a target of at least 500 of these Short Range Ballistic Missiles (SRBM) produced by 2005.⁹⁰

2. DF-15

This missile is a more sophisticated SRBM with a range of up to 600 km for a nuclear warhead up to 350 kt. It employs an inertial guidance system with a CEP of 280 meters with plans to increase accuracy to 30-45 meters. It enjoys several other advantages including integration with an all digital control system enabling a launch time of 30 minutes from highly mobile launch vehicles. The body of the missile provides camouflage for the warhead during its downward trajectory by trailing behind it, being ten times larger than the warhead. It forms the mainstay of China's SRBM's with an estimated 250 deployed in Leping, Nanping and Yangan provinces, all located within striking distance of Taiwan. When China demonstrated its missile capabilities in 1995 and 1996 with multiple accurate launches, it used DF-15 missiles in its political move to dissuade Taiwan from independence. Upon possible resolution of the Taiwan crisis, the unused or left over DF-15 missiles could easily be redeployed to other areas within China.

⁸⁹ Paul H. B. Godwin "Potential Chinese Responses to US Ballistic Missile Defense," China and Missile Defense: Managing U.S.-PRC Strategic Relations, Stimson Center, 2002.

⁹⁰ "Theater Missile Systems – China Nuclear Forces," Federation of American Scientists <<http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/china/theater/index.html>> accessed 15 June 2005.

3. JL-1

The JL-1 is a dual stage submarine-launched ballistic missile, currently deployed on the Xia Type 092 class submarine. The submarine can carry 12 of these 200-300 kt nuclear warheads with a range of 1,700 km and a CEP of 300-400 meters.⁹¹ There is speculation whether or not the single Xia class submarine is in operation due to the limited practicality of this weapon and lack of submarine experience in the Chinese navy. The Xia submarine has never traveled outside Chinese regional waters.⁹²

4. DF-21

The DF-21 is land-version of the JL-1 missile with a similar range of 1,800 km, a 200-300 kt warhead and a CEP of 300-400 meters. As with other ballistic missile systems, plans are underway to increase the accuracy of its guidance system. Because of its extended range the DF-21 is gradually replacing the DF-3 missile. Despite being a shorter range missile, it can still reach many strategic locations in Asia, including Japan from its Tonghua base near North Korea. Currently an estimated 100 are produced with around 50 of them being deployed.⁹³

5. DF-3

The DF-3 is a long-range, liquid-fueled missile with a range of 3,000 km. It can carry a single 700-3,000 kt warhead or three smaller 50-100 kt warheads. It has the capability of being silo-launched or being employed from portable launch pads. It is currently being phased out of the Chinese inventory as DF-15 missiles are adequate for use against Taiwan, the United States no longer has bases in the Philippines and the more advanced DF-21 is filling much of the same role. There are an estimated 40 of these still deployed although DF-3 launchers are being converted for use with the DF-21.⁹⁴

6. DF-4

The DF-4 is a dual stage rocket based on the DF-3 with an additional added stage. It has the ability to launch a 3 megaton nuclear warhead a distance of 4,500 – 6,000 km. It requires a two hour fueling period and must either be rolled out or elevated to launch

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² “Type 092 (Xia Class) Ballistic Missile Nuclear Submarine,” <<http://www.sinodefence.com/navy/sub/092.asp>> accessed 15 June 2005.

⁹³ “Theater Missile Systems – China Nuclear Forces,” Federation of American Scientists.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

site, usually being stored underneath tall mountains in tunnels. There are an estimated 20 DF-4 missiles in the Chinese inventory.⁹⁵

7. Summary of Chinese Theater Missile Capabilities

Chinese theater missile capabilities currently appear to have a current and short-term focus upon deterring a Taiwanese declaration of independence and usage if such an event were to occur. According to a recent Congressional Research Service Report, there are between 650 and 730 DF-15 and DF-11 missiles deployed directly across Taiwan with the numbers increasing yearly.⁹⁶ However, missiles deployed elsewhere do have the capability to easily reach Japan, a fact not lost on the Japanese people themselves. Although the United States is currently pursuing a policy of strategic ambiguity with regards to Taiwan, any outbreak of hostilities between China and Taiwan would conceivably endanger the United States and because of their close relationship, Japan as well.

D. BRIEF OVERVIEW OF MISSILE DEFENSE TERMINOLOGY

Before discussing the TMD debate within Japan, it is necessary to give an introduction to basic aspects of TMD and Ground Based Midcourse Defense (GMD, previous referred to as NMD in the Clinton Administration) in general. The U.S. Missile Defense Agency (MDA) divides its layered system of missile defense into three target areas: boost phase defense, midcourse phase defense and terminal phase defense. Boost phase defense is an upper-tier defense system, meaning it focuses on upper to exo-atmospheric interception of the missile, usually intended for long-range missiles.

The boost phase lasts approximately three to five minutes after launch to an altitude of around 300 miles. The main boost phase defense systems are the Airborne Laser (ABL) and Kinetic Energy Interceptors (KEI). The ABL is a Boeing 747-mounted laser designed to focus heat upon the surface of the missile until it explodes and is targeted against short, medium or long-range missiles. The goal of KEI is to use mobile

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Andrew Feickert, "Missile survey: Ballistic and Cruise Missiles of Selected Foreign Countries," CRS Report for Congress, 26 July 2005, 12 .

launch missiles to intercept targets with their boost engines still engaged as they fight against the atmosphere and later expand the capability to midcourse phase interception.⁹⁷

Midcourse phase defense, another upper tier system, occurs after the target vehicle's thrust ceases and it follows a more predictable glide path. This phase lasts about 20 minutes, allowing for easier tracking and interception in theory, but this period is where most interception countermeasures such as decoys are deployed. The two midcourse phase defense systems are the GMD and Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (previously referred to as Navy Theater Wide or NTW in the Clinton Administration). GMD relies upon a comprehensive system of sensors and radars to track a vehicle's flight path and the launch of a kill vehicle to destroy it on impact using hit-to-kill technology rather than explosion. With this system, collision would occur above or just in the atmosphere and the debris would burn away upon re-entry. Six interceptors are currently deployed in Ft. Greely, Alaska with plans to add ten more within the year. The Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense employs similar technology except it is launched from Aegis cruisers and can engage targets in both ascent and descent stages, reducing the opportunities for countermeasures to be activated. It uses the Standard Missile-3 (SM-3) currently equipped on Aegis cruisers.⁹⁸

Terminal phase defense occurs as the warhead enters the atmosphere on its return trajectory to the earth and lasts from around 30 seconds to one minute. The primary defense systems are Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) and the PATRIOT Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3). THAAD is an upper tier system designed to destroy the warhead as it transitions from midcourse to terminal phase and is geared towards short and medium range ballistic missiles. It fires from a mobile, truck-based launch vehicle and together with radar and command, control and battle management (C2BM) components it can be easily deployed via C-130. The PAC-3 is the latest generation of PATRIOT defense capability and is a lower tier system designed to intercept missiles as they descend in the atmosphere. PAC-3 is the most developed component of the overall ballistic missile defense system and fires from a mobile launcher capable of holding 16

⁹⁷ "BMD Basics," Missile Defense Agency, <<http://www.mda.mil/mdalink/html/basics.html>> accessed 16 June 2005.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

interceptors at once. It is also capable of destroying other air threats such as cruise missiles, unmanned aerial vehicles and aircraft. According to a recent Congressional Research Service Report, the Patriot missile defense system intercepted Iraqi missiles in nine out of nine engagements.⁹⁹ Both systems of terminal phase defense use hit-to-kill technology.¹⁰⁰

E. EVOLUTION OF U.S.-JAPAN TMD COOPERATION

The internal debate regarding the acceptability and feasibility of Japanese participation in a TMD system has been slow, punctuated by periods of rapid debate only during times of high crisis. Understanding the debate within the United States is also useful as pressure from Washington is a major driver for debate within Japan, hence the included discussion about key factors regarding the issue in America.

Discussions between the United States and Japan regarding missile defense originated in the beginning of the 1980s with the start of the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) by the Reagan administration in 1983.¹⁰¹ In 1989, the United States and Japan initiated a joint study, Strategic Defense Initiative Office Western Pacific (SDIO WESTPAC), which lasted for four years and recommended Japan adopt THAAD, a satellite communications network and explore sea-based ballistic missile defense options. It concluded the North Korean Nodong missile was the major future threat in Japan's security, no doubt reinforced by North Korean missile testing during this same period.¹⁰² In 1991, Japan became the first nation to purchase United States Patriot missiles. However, there were several problems in the early 1990s hindering cooperation between the United States and Japan. The original proposal of Global Protection Against Limited Strikes (GPALS) included space-based elements to destroy missiles, violating Japan's non-weaponization of space laws, a cooperative architecture which caused a conflict with Japan's legal restraints on collective security and allowed the sharing of BMD technology

⁹⁹ Shirley A. Kan, "Taiwan: Major U.S. Arms Sales Since 1990," CRS Report for Congress, 5 July 2005, 11.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Michael Swaine, Rachel Swanger, Takashi Kawakami, "Japan and Ballistic Missile Defense", RAND Corporation, 2001, 19.

¹⁰² Patrick M. Cronin, Paul Giarra and Michael J. Green, "The Alliance Implications of Theater Missile Defense," *The U.S.-Japan Alliance: Past, Present and Future*, ed. by Michael J. Green and Patrick M. Cronin, New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1999, 171.

which could possibly violate Japanese constraints on arms exports. Furthermore, the entire issue was framed in an antagonistic way by the United States as a method to obtain Japanese technology and funding in order to cut costs, reduce the trade imbalance between the two countries, and alleviate “free rider” claims against Japan not contributing to its own defense. Lastly, reducing Japanese options to mainly the purchase of finished American products posed a threat to Japanese defense industries.¹⁰³

Within the United States, the debate for missile defense was given a boost by claims of the effectiveness of Patriot missiles against Scud missiles in Iraq. Although it was later revealed effectiveness was due more to the explosion of patriot missiles in the vicinity of Scud missiles which caused them to veer off path, such information was not available at the time.¹⁰⁴ Despite such impressions, the Democratic Party, the majority party, put forth strong opposition on the basis of feasibility and the danger of upsetting arms agreements with Russia. Nor was the George H. W. Bush administration fully behind the issue of ballistic missile defense and there was a lack of consolidated support which relegated the issue to budget-induced irrelevance.

The next round of hard debate within the United States regarding ballistic missile defense was after the Republican Contract with America in 1994, where ballistic missile defense was one part of the overall agenda and promise which made American voters give a Republican majority in the Senate and the first Republican majority in the House of Representatives in over four decades. As a result of political maneuvering, much of the Republican initiative was stalled and many conservatives balked at the large price tag of missile defense. The 1995 National Intelligence Estimate which stated it would be at least 15 years before a credible threat to the United States from ballistic missiles could even emerge if pursued. This was used to effectively stifle very meaningful budget allocation towards ballistic missile defense and the debate over its relevance foundered.¹⁰⁵

Overseas, Washington and Tokyo repackaged the issue as a matter of alliance management and the U.S.-Japan Theater Missile Defense Working Group was

¹⁰³ Swaine, et al., “Japan and Ballistic Missile Defense”, 20-21.

¹⁰⁴ Major Garrett, *The Enduring Revolution*, New York: Crown Forum, 2005, 196.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 204-205.

established to focus on reconciling needs with constraints. In 1995, Japan purchased 24 PAC-2 missiles, the predecessor to PAC-3. A study concluded by the group in 1998 recommended the Japanese Maritime Self-Defense Force (JMSDF) was the logical path of implementation considering the existence of Japanese Aegis cruisers and flexibility of the NTW system. More importantly, it coincided with the Japanese shipbuilding industry's desire to build more Aegis cruisers and would allow domestic defense industries time to develop their version of the PAC-3.¹⁰⁶ Of no small importance was the Chinese test firing of DF-15 missiles in the vicinity of Taiwan in 1995 and 1996 in increasing the sense of Japanese vulnerability to ballistic missiles.¹⁰⁷

Two events provided the issue of ballistic missile defense more momentum both in the United States and in Japan. The first, and more focused within the United States, was the Rumsfeld Commission to Assess the Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States which was a bipartisan panel of nine members, five Republican and four Democrat, in 1997. This panel was composed of the CIA Director George Tenet and chaired by Donald Rumsfeld, who later became George W. Bush's secretary of defense. Also included were Paul Wolfowitz, the future deputy secretary of defense and the staff director Steven Cambone who would become the deputy undersecretary for defense policy. Its unanimous key conclusions, published in July 1998, emphasized the growing ballistic missile threats from nations such as Iraq, Iran and North Korea along with the constant threat from Russia and China and the inability of the intelligence community to properly estimate the dangers, capabilities and indications of ballistic missile threats. While it did not mention the 1995 National Intelligence Estimate specifically by name, it was strongly implied as a direct refutation.¹⁰⁸

The timing of the Rumsfeld Commission Report added greatly to its impact on the debate. Barely a month later, the North Korean testing of a Taepodong missile which flew over Japan and into the Pacific Ocean on August 31, 1998, provided the next spur for TMD cooperation. While the Rumsfeld Commission revitalized the debate within the

¹⁰⁶ Cronin et al., "The Alliance Implications of Theater Missile Defense," 172-173.

¹⁰⁷ Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) in Northeast Asia: An Annotated Chronology, 1990-2003, East Asia Nonproliferation Project, Center for Nonproliferation Studies, March 2003.

¹⁰⁸ Garrett, 207-208.

United States, the North Korean launch appeared to validate the need for a ballistic missile defense by the Japanese as well. Public opinion and support shifted towards TMD and Japan officially began supporting the United States TMD program. Despite opposition by the Japanese Socialist and Communist Parties and some members expressing reservation or opposition in the Komeito and Democratic Parties, the Diet allocated funds in the Defense Agency's budget for BMD cooperation efforts. This opposition centered mainly on constitutional objections, as with other issues regarding the expansion of SDF capabilities. Japan agreed to research sea-based BMD capabilities and produce prototypes of various components. In addition, Japan began spy satellite production, later launching two successfully yet losing two in November 2003 due to launch errors.¹⁰⁹ The error was traced to a solid booster rocket failing to separate from the satellites after burning out due to equipment failure resulting from the booster nozzle which had burned through.¹¹⁰

While perceptions of the North Korean missile threat certainly provide strong impetus for support of TMD in Japan, strong Washington backing of the program should not be downplayed. George W. Bush's election campaign in 2000 included the plank of BMD as an essential national defense issue. His election saw key members of the above-mentioned Rumsfeld Commission enter positions of key leadership, including Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, and Deputy Undersecretary for Defense Policy Steven Cambone. Their appointments were far from arbitrary and combined with a solidifying Republican majority suggest continued backing for BMD for the foreseeable future. One of the most significant changes in approach taken by the Bush administration was the elimination of the distinction between national missile defense and theater missile defense. This was undertaken on the realization that a theater missile defense with respect to a system designed to protect United States troops abroad could very well constitute a national missile defense for the host nation. While seemingly a semantic difference, it also means a theater missile defense could be part of a system protecting the United States, which brings up collective defense issues which

¹⁰⁹ Swaine, et al., "Japan and Ballistic Missile Defense", 34-36.

¹¹⁰ Steven, Berner. "Japan's Space Program: A Fork in the Road?" RAND 2005, 18.

raise warning flags in the Japanese debate over missile defense.¹¹¹ Congressional approval of spending for missile defense supports this as \$7.6 billion was approved for fiscal year 2003, \$9.1 billion for fiscal year 2004, \$9.95 billion for fiscal year 2005 and the House has recently approved a bill for \$8.58 billion for fiscal year 2006. In all cases, the amount of approved money has closely matched the amount requested for appropriation.¹¹² Firm backing from Washington of BMD resulted in steady pressure for Tokyo to adopt a similar stance regarding TMD.

However, the primary factor prompting more support for TMD in Japan still remains the recent North Korean nuclear crisis and missile threat. Following the Taepodong missile launch in 1998, cooperation between Japan and the United States over missile defense became more palatable. Less than a month later, Tokyo formally announced the decision to accept the United States proposal for a TMD system on 20 September 1998, specifically citing the North Korea launch as a primary rationale. About a year later on 16 August 1999, Japan and the United States government signed a memorandum of understanding stating a five-year joint research and development program for missile defense would commence with Japan spending around \$300 million.¹¹³

In recent years, there has been a shift from pure research and development to more concrete agreements. Aiding this is the fact TMD has not proven to be an exception to Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi's strong support for the United States in many policy areas. This creates a harmonization between Washington and Tokyo regarding several contentious aspects of missile defense. In late December 2003, Tokyo declared it would start to actually implement a missile defense system, with the spread of missile and weapons of mass destruction proliferation as a key factor for the decision.¹¹⁴ Chief Cabinet Secretary Fukuda Yasuo was clear in stating any missile defense would be

¹¹¹ Richard P. Cronin, "Japan-U.S. Cooperation on Ballistic Missile Defense: Issues and Prospects," CRS Report for Congress, 19 March 2002, 10-11.

¹¹² Steven A. Hildreth, "Missile Defense: The Current Debate," CRS Report for Congress, 19 July 2005, 40-41.

¹¹³ Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) in Northeast Asia: An Annotated Chronology, 1990-2003.

¹¹⁴ Ralph A. Cossa and Brad Glosserman, "U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation: Has Japan Become the Great Britain of Asia?" *Issues & Insights* Vol. 5, no. 3 (March 2005), Pacific Forum CSIS, 17.

used solely for the defense of Japan, not be a threat to neighboring countries, and not for the defense of any third country.¹¹⁵ Japan has since agreed to deploy SM-3 missiles on its Kongo class Aegis cruisers in 2007 and to continue its research cooperation with the United States.¹¹⁶ In November 2004, Washington agreed to give Japan license to domestically produce PAC-3 interceptors as part of Japanese TMD efforts.¹¹⁷ In the meantime, Japan is expected to continue purchasing PAC-3 interceptors from the United States, which began early in 2005 with the sale of 16 interceptors by Lockheed-Martin.¹¹⁸ Further evidence of Japan's commitment, National Defense Program Guidelines in December 2004 made specific mention for the first time of China and North Korea being the primary threats to Japanese security. In addition, it directly stated Japan's commitment not only to aid BMD research defense but also the purchase and development of BMD as part of its overall strategy to combat the threat of ballistic missiles, something repeatedly mentioned throughout the entire document.¹¹⁹ In February 2005, a meeting between United States Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and Japan's Minister for Foreign Affairs Machimura Nobutaka and Minister of State for Defense and Director-General of the Defense Agency Ohno Yoshinori resulted in the U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee Joint Statement. Amongst other things, it re-affirmed the mutual benefit and continued support for cooperative missile defense efforts between the two countries.¹²⁰

F. CURRENT INTERNAL DEBATE ON TMD IN JAPAN

Studying domestic debate within Japan regarding missile defense requires an understanding of key domestic players and the issues of contention. While dated, Swaine, Swanger and Kawakami's "Japan and Missile Defense" offers a useful

¹¹⁵ Fukuda Yasuo, "Naikakukanbouchoukan danwa" 19 December 2003 <<http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/tyokan/koizumi/2003/1219danwa.html>> accessed 26 August 2005.

¹¹⁶ Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) in Northeast Asia: An Annotated Chronology, 1990-2003.

¹¹⁷ "US agrees to Japan's licensed production of PAC-3 missiles: report," Associated French Press, <<http://www.spacewar.com/2004/041123050145.ztipt049.html>> accessed 16 June 2005.

¹¹⁸ "Lockheed Martin Receives \$532 Million Production Contract," Press Release, Lockheed Martin, <<http://www.lockheedmartin.com/wms/findPage.do?dsp=fec&ci=16336&rsbci=0&fti=112&ti=0&sc=400>> accessed 16 June 2005.

¹¹⁹ National Defense Program Guidelines: FY2005-, Japan Defense Agency, 2004.

¹²⁰ Joint Statement of the U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee, 19 February 2005.

framework of analysis which includes eight key domestic players and six key issues on which they interact, to which the author adds a seventh, the North Korea factor.

Table 1. Key Domestic Players and Issues for Japanese Missile Defense¹²¹

Key Domestic Players	Key Issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Prime Minister and the Cabinet • The JDA and the Self-Defense Forces • The Ministry of Foreign Affairs • The Ministry of Finance • The Diet • The Political Parties • The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry and Private Business • The Public and the Media. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alliance Maintenance • Financial Constraints • Legal Considerations • Technical Feasibility and Architecture issues • Industrial/Commercial Considerations • The China Factor • The North Korea Factor

1. The Prime Minister and the Cabinet

As the arbiters of executive responsibility within the Japanese political system, the prime minister along with his cabinet are in the position of wielding extensive influence over the Japanese debate regarding missile defense. The consensus nature of Japanese politics makes it impossible for the prime minister to solely direct policy on any issue let alone missile defense, but skillful political maneuvering can result in a considerable amount of agenda setting and a measure of control over policy direction. Furthermore, government interpretation of the various legal considerations such as collective defense, arms sales, and what constitutes “defensive defense” are important facets determining the implementation of a missile defense by Japan. One tool at the disposal of the prime minister has always been the pursuit of close relations with the United States. Reflecting a general move towards alliance management with the United States and the overall repackaging of missile defense as an alliance issue, Japanese Prime Minister Hashimoto Ryutaro began the trend of securing funding for cooperative missile defense efforts in the mid-1990s which was continued by his successor, former Foreign

¹²¹ Information taken from Swaine, et al., “Japan and Ballistic Missile Defense”, 41, 63.

Minister Obuchi Keizo when he assumed office in 1998. During his term the memorandum of understanding between Japan and the United States was signed wherein both countries agreed on a role for Japan in the research and development of a missile defense system. His efforts in promoting missile defense were more of a delegation to his Chief Cabinet Secretary Nonaka Hiromu who was instrumental in capitalizing on the North Korean Taepodong missile launch.¹²² Prime Minister Obuchi suffered a stroke in April 2000 and was replaced by Mori Yoshiro who resigned just a year later. He was replaced by current LDP Prime Minister Koizumi Junichiro in April 2001, being elected the most populist prime minister in Japanese history and on the promises of reform.

Before Koizumi's prime ministership, the direction from Japan's executive was a steady move towards joint research and development with the United States without any clear, established vision towards the long term. Furthermore, there was more emphasis given on Japan's research role rather than a commitment to actual implementation and adoption by Japanese forces. The entire issue of missile defense represents not only an opportunity for a prime minister to demonstrate his support for the United States, but also a pitfall which could cause instability.¹²³ As such, most prime ministers in the past have chosen to approach the issue very cautiously.

Prime Minister Koizumi has demonstrated a willingness to strongly support the actions and policies of the United States regardless of specific levels of popularity of his decisions. Most notable is his decision to send SDF forces to contribute to the stabilization of Iraq, an action unpopular with the majority of the Japanese people. Regarding North Korea, he has adopted a hard line stance compatible with Washington's view as well as large segments of the Japanese population, although this is in conflict with Seoul's wishes for a more accommodating approach. Capitalizing on anxiety over North Korea's actions, he has continually pushed not only for joint research of missile defense but development as well. He recognized early the legal considerations of missile defense and considers reinterpreting or amending the Constitution a viable option. This is part of an overall strategy to better enable cooperation between the SDF and the United

¹²² Ibid., 42-44.

¹²³ Ibid., 42-43.

States military on a wide range of security issues, which many see as Japan's quickening approach to normalization.

Part of Koizumi's ability to implement large changes in direction from a Japanese political standpoint is his popularity with the Japanese people. As long as Koizumi maintains popular support overall he will be able to continually back missile defense as part of pursuing close ties with the United States. This popularity was put to the test during the lower house elections on September 11, 2005. Koizumi's pursuit of postal reform has always been part of his reform agenda in politics and he dissolved the lower house of the Japanese national Diet on August 8, 2005 after the upper house failed to pass a postal reform bill which only narrowly passed the more powerful lower house. 37 LDP members stood opposed to postal reform. Koizumi stated those still opposed to the bill would not be allowed to run with LDP support during the elections, which he maintains are a way for the Japanese people to voice their opinion in Japanese politics. If the LDP and New Komeito coalition fails to win a majority, Koizumi says he will step down as prime minister.¹²⁴ Interestingly enough, DPJ opposition leader Okada Katsuya announced he would resign if the DPJ did not win the majority, raising the stakes for the election.¹²⁵ Koizumi's move was seen as a way to exert pressure on the upper house, which is less powerful than the lower house but can not be dissolved by the prime minister. The postal service, with \$3 trillion in assets, is a large support base for the LDP and hence Koizumi's difficulty in persuading all LDP members to follow his lead. One of Koizumi's main motivations for privatization is the large amounts of new money circulated in the private sector with a potential to revitalize much of the economy. According to polls conducted by the *Mainichi Shimbun*, the *Yomiuri Shimbun*, the *Asahi Shimbun*, and the *Nihon Keizai*, Koizumi's popularity and support for the LDP among the Japanese people rose since his call for a snap election.¹²⁶ These numbers were accurately reflected during the election, which resulted in a land-slide victory for the LDP. The LDP increased its number of seats to 296, up from 212 and well within the majority of

¹²⁴ "Koizumi calls election for Sept. 11," Japan Times Online, 9 August 2005 <<http://www.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/getarticle.pl5?nn20050809a1.htm>> accessed 26 August 2005.

¹²⁵ "Okada says he will resign as DPJ head if his party loses in election" Kyodo News, 9 August 2005 <<http://home.kyodo.co.jp/modules/fstStory/index.php?storyid=197012>> accessed 26 August 2005.

¹²⁶ Mainichi Shimbun poll 26 August 2005, Yomiuri Shimbun poll 26 August 2005, Asahi Shimbun poll 26 August 2005, Nihon Keizai poll 25 August 2005.

the 480 seat chamber. The New Komeito Party, the LDP's ruling coalition partner, lost three seats for a total of 31. This mandate from the people is a clear sign the Japanese population is willing to maintain support for Koizumi because of his promises of reform, despite the unpopularity of SDF deployment to Iraq. Consequently, strong support for missile defense will continue from the office of the prime minister and his cabinet.

2. The JDA and the Self-Defense Forces

Japan's emphasis on civilian control of the military has relegated the status of defense affairs to an agency, rather than a ministry, level position. However, the direct military nature of this security issue leads the JDA to be highly involved in the debate over missile defense. For the JDA, three prevalent attitudes exist: those concerned about the budget, those concerned about research and development, and those concerned about maintaining a close security relationship with the United States. The latter two see missile defense as an avenue for advancing their interests while the former sees the high cost as a danger to other defense programs. On the whole, there has been a shift towards growing advocacy by the JDA in light of the North Korean and Chinese missile threat and the recasting of missile defense as an alliance maintenance issue.¹²⁷

a. Japanese Ground Self Defense Force

The Japanese Ground Self Defense Force (JGSDF) initially stood to gain the least from joint missile defense efforts as little operational control of key components would be under JGSDF control yet they would have to bear some of its cost. However, the JGSDF does have a large component of more strategy-focused members who view the importance of overall Japanese security as an integral part of decision making. Furthermore, missile defense efforts offer an opportunity to upgrade existing command, control, communications, computers and intelligence (C4I) and the chance to replace outdated Hawk air defense batteries with spin-off technology.¹²⁸ Perhaps the Midterm Defense Program for fiscal years 2005-2009 earmarking the acquisition of eight medium-range surface-to-air missile batteries for the JGSDF and the dropping of a proposal to reduce the size of the JGSDF to 120,000 members (authorized troop strength is 161,000

¹²⁷ Swaine, et. al., 46-47.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 47.

by 2009 in the Midterm Defense Program although troop size is targeted at around 149,000) reflects some of these concerns.¹²⁹

b. Japanese Air Self Defense Force

The Japanese Air Self Defense Force (JASDF) stands to gain from missile defense cooperation as it retains operational control over its missile defense systems. Furthermore, the JASDF has much to gain from a modernized C4I infrastructure in conjunction with a missile defense system. Opposition, while not in the majority, would come from those concerned over budget cuts for other programs such as a new-generation fighter.¹³⁰ The Midterm Defense Program allocates the upgrading of patriot missile capabilities while still allowing for modernization and acquisition of new fighters. It also states the desire to modernize the Base Air Defense Ground Environment (BADGE) to aid detection and tracking of ballistic missiles.¹³¹

c. Japanese Marine Self Defense Force

The branch of service with the most to gain is the Japanese Marine Self Defense Force (JMSDF). While the United States scrapped the Clinton administration's Navy Theater Wide program, incorporating elements of it into mid-course and boost phase intercept programs, it offers justification for the acquisition of Kongo-class AEGIS destroyers, emphasis on naval spending, and improvements in personnel training and C4I.¹³² Consequently, the JMSDF is the most vocal advocate of missile defense in the JDA. The Midterm Defense Program reflects this advocacy and announces a large focus on technical research behind sea-based upper tier engagement of ballistic missiles and an improvement of AEGIS destroyers.¹³³

On balance, there has been a decided shift towards support of missile defense in the face of North Korean and Chinese missile threats. While there are concerns about the costs of such efforts, it is seen as an effective way to increase the security relationship with the United States, modernize C4I components of the JSDF and promote joint operations as well as operations with the United States, and enhance the national defense

¹²⁹ Midterm Defense Program 2005-2009, Japanese Defense Agency 2004.

¹³⁰ Swaine et. al, 48.

¹³¹ Midterm Defense Program 2005-2009, Japanese Defense Agency 2004.

¹³² Swaine et. al., 49.

¹³³ Midterm Defense Program 2005-2009, Japanese Defense Agency 2004.

image of the JSDF by providing a concrete defense against what much of the Japanese public feels is the largest security threat facing Japan. This concerted drive for missile defense places it at odds with the Ministry of Finance, as no service is willing to just accept cuts in order to accommodate increased defense spending on missile defense.

3. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA) has an active interest in the missile defense debate as it has large strategic impact on Japan's relationship with the United States, China, North Korea, South Korea and Russia. In the earlier days, the views of "China hands" in the ministry were a heavy influence and MOFA often cautioned against missile defense cooperation as it would antagonize Beijing. After growing politicization of Sino-Japanese relations, the North Korean Taepodong launch in 1998, the dwindling in number of pro-China members of the LDP and increased nationalism among younger generations of Japanese politicians, MOFA changed directions.¹³⁴ Some officials state MOFA support for missile defense already existed before the Taepodong launch, but it provided a convenient opportunity to publicly state their position.¹³⁵ While certainly still cognizant of the negative impact the pursuit of missile defense cooperation has on Sino-Japanese relations, efforts have focused on convincing China that any Japanese missile defense system is solely defensive, will not be used to defend other countries, and is not a threat to China. In addition, MOFA tends to emphasize the close relationship the effort garners with the United States regardless of the actual effectiveness of the system. In a speech commemorating the sixtieth year after the end of World War II and US-Japan relations in April 2005, Foreign Affairs Minister Machimura Nobutaka made specific mention of the North Korean missile threat, Japan's continued dedication to implementing (not just researching) missile defense and the importance of the security relationship between Japan and the United States.¹³⁶

¹³⁴ Michael H. Armacost and Kenneth B. Pyle, "Japan and the Engagement of China: Challenges for U.S. Policy Coordination," NBR Analysis Vol 12, no. 5 (December 2001): 31-32.

¹³⁵ Evan S. Medeiros, "Ballistic Missile Defense and Northeast Asian Security: Views from Washington, Beijing and Tokyo," Stanley Foundation and Center for Nonproliferation Studies, Monterey Institute of International Studies, April 2001, 17.

¹³⁶ Machimura Nobutaka "Japan's Global Strategy and the Japan-US Global Partnership on the 60th Anniversary of the End of World War II," speech given in New York, 29 April 2005.

4. The Ministry of Finance

Predictably, the Ministry of Finance is more concerned with the budgetary aspect of missile defense rather than its military or political implications. The amount of opposition to missile defense from the Ministry of Finance is proportional to the degree increased spending on missile defense hampers its efforts to cut spending overall. In the face of strong backing for missile defense from many quarters, the Ministry of Finance is now concerned with minimizing costs while maintaining cautious approval of the program. Because missile defense represents a large increase in cost for the JDA, most of the tension is not over whether to allow missile defense in the budget, but in a struggle against the services, especially the JGSDF, to force cuts in other areas to make room for missile defense. Over the past three years, the Ministry of Finance has placed a one percent decrease in the national defense budget even as the budget for missile defense has increased. Therefore the emphasis has been on support for missile defense, enhanced intelligence and logistics while slimming down the force size and favoring quality over quantity.¹³⁷ The release of the National Defense Program Outline reflected the struggle between the Ministry of Finance and the JDA as the Ministry of Finance sought to continue its one percent reductions in the defense budget for the next five years. In addition to cutting the number of JGSDF troops, the number of tanks was reduced from 900 to 600, escort ships from 50 to 47, and fighter planes from 300 to 260. This was all to accommodate the ten billion dollar cost of missile defense over the next ten years.¹³⁸ As long as Japan shows no definitive signs of permanent economic recovery, it is expected the Ministry of Finance will extract a hard bargain from the JDA in return for approving missile defense.

5. The Diet

The Diet has two major leverage points on the ballistic missile debate. The first is the authority to approve the budget which would include funding for missile defense. Debate over funding offers a venue for opposition based on, or reinterpretations of, various legal considerations surrounding missile defense. The second regards its interpretation of the traditional stance based on a 1967 Diet resolution declaring Japan's

¹³⁷ "Highlights of the Budget for FY2005," Ministry of Finance, 2005.

¹³⁸ David Fouse, "Japan's FY 2005 National Defense Program Outline: New Concepts, Old Compromises," *Asia-Pacific Security Studies* Vol. 4, no. 3 (March 2005): 3.

peaceful use of space. Some analysts view the broadening debate within the Diet as a mere stating of political positions rather than having serious implications for the actual direction of policy. Therefore much of the meaningful debate will occur within political parties who will take an overall stance in the Diet.¹³⁹

Recent action by the Diet has confirmed this view, with the past several years seeing the Diet following the lead of Prime Minister Koizumi Junichiro on a wide variety of issues related to cooperation with the United States and other security matters. These include the enactment of various emergency legislation, special measures, and laws which increase the capability of the SDF to act independently or in conjunction with the United States in defense contingencies. Increasing perception of a North Korean threat has created the environment for actions such as solid Diet support for the deployment of reconnaissance satellites to monitor developments on the Korean peninsula, blurring the principle of “peaceful use of space” by allowing defense related usage of space. This perception has also served as a prime mover allowing the Koizumi cabinet to push through support of missile defense efforts with Diet approval for funding. While it is by no means unanimous support, the combination of strong executive backing, the prospects for close security ties with the United States, and the North Korean threat makes it difficult to overcome the push for missile defense.

The September 11, 2005 lower house elections resulted in a landslide victory for the pro-missile defense LDP. All 480 seats were up for election, with 212 seats held by the LDP, not counting the 37 held by those opposed to postal reform which ran independently or in new parties. The coalition partner New Komeito Party had 34 seats for a combined 246 seats, five more than the 241 required for a majority. The DPJ had 175 defending seats.¹⁴⁰ The gaining of 84 seats by the LDP, the DPJ loss of 64 seats, and New Komeito’s loss of 3 seats means the LDP is a majority party with 296 seats even without the New Komeito coalition.¹⁴¹

¹³⁹ Swaine et. al., 55-56.

¹⁴⁰ Masaki Hisane “US Eye on Japan’s polls,” Asia Times Online 27 August 2005 <<http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Japan/GH27Dh02.html>> accessed 27 August 2005.

¹⁴¹ “Election 2005,” Mainichi Online 13 September 2005 <<http://mdn.mainichi-msn.co.jp/features/election2005/>> accessed 13 September 2005.

6. Political Parties

The Japanese political scene consists of five main political parties, the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), the New Komeito, The Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ), The Japanese Communist Party (JCP) and the Social Democratic Party (SDP). Their stances towards missile defense drive much of the Diet debate, which is mainly the stating of those political stances.

a. Liberal Democratic Party

The ruling LDP has demonstrated support for missile defense and Koizumi's security policies with regards to cooperation with the United States. This is in line with the LDP's very conservative stance and desire for a strong relationship with the United States. The LDP has been responsive to the North Korean missile threat and will follow the lead of any prime minister who pushes missile defense for the foreseeable future. Enjoying majority rule for most of post-World War II Japanese history, it still holds broad public support despite recent gains of the opposition Democratic Party of Japan. Having gained a majority in the lower house of the Diet even without the New Komeito Party, the LDP now has 296 seats, well above the 241 required for a Majority. While it still needs the New Komeito party for a majority in the upper house, the LDP has more bargaining power with the New Komeito, which has been seen as a moderating force on LDP policies.

b. New Komeito

The New Komeito, or New Clean Government Party, is the junior member of the ruling coalition with the LDP. It tends to be a conservative reform party with a peaceful view towards international politics due to its Buddhist affiliations. Though New Komeito throws its support behind the LDP for missile defense, it has acted as a moderator for much of the LDP's attempts to gain military acquisitions and to stretch the allowable legal framework for security cooperation between the United States and Japan. In recent years, the LDP relied more upon the New Komeito as the DPJ gained more support in urban electoral areas.¹⁴² Despite earlier claims, New Komeito head Kanzaki Takenori backed the LDP during the September 11th election due to the LDP's emphasis

¹⁴² Fouse, "Japan's FY 2005 National Defense Program Outline: New Concepts, Old Compromises," 3.

on reform embodied by postal privatization, during which it lost 3 seats.¹⁴³ There may be a declining level of influence by the New Komeito with the LDP, but both parties renewed their coalition as the LDP still needs the New Komeito to hold a majority in the upper house.¹⁴⁴

c. Democratic Party of Japan

The DPJ is the main opposition party to the LDP and headed by Okada Katsuya. The DPJ holds that the security relationship between Japan and the United States is important, but Japan should not allow itself to be dragged into programs or engagements solely for the sake of alliance maintenance. With regards to missile defense, it has yet to find a definitive consensus on where it stands. Under Kan Naoto, who resigned last year, the DPJ listed in its manifesto a firm support for missile defense and its development. In a vision statement released last May, Okada said a DPJ government would “pursue the missile defense option after it verifies its technical feasibility.”¹⁴⁵ While not a firm commitment, it is not a denouncement, either. . It opposes the SDF deployment in Iraq although it moderated recent statements in recognition that if the DPJ did gain a majority, it would stand to gain from cordial relations with the United States. With 175 seats going into the September 11th election, this could have been a possibility had the trend of Koizumi’s increasing popularity reversed itself. However, the polls surged strongly in favor of postal reform and the DPJ lost 64 seats, reducing their presence in the lower house to 113 seats.

d. Japanese Communist Party and Social Democratic Party

The JCP is the next major opposition party although it only has nine members in the lower house of the Diet. The SDP follows behind with only five members in the lower house, having lost a seat in the recent election. Both of these parties are strongly opposed to missile defense on the basis of pacifism, opposition to any military force including the SDF, or the belief that Japan does not face a missile threat.

¹⁴³ Kajimoto Tetsushi “New Komeito backs LDP reforms, rules out DPJ,” Japan Times Online 20 August 2005 <<http://www.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/getarticle.pl5?nn20050820a4.htm>> accessed 28 August 2005.

¹⁴⁴ “LDP, Komeito Renew Coalition Accord,” Mainichi Online 13 September 2005 <<http://mdn.mainichi-msn.co.jp/features/election2005/news/20050912p2a00m0na046000c.html>> accessed 13 September 2005.

¹⁴⁵ Okada Katsuya, “Toward Realization of Enlightened National Interest: Living Harmoniously with Asia and the World,” 18 May 2005.

There are some who state they would support a “leak-proof” missile defense which would work against any and all threats, thus ridding the need for any other SDF forces, but this represents an impossibility. The influence and voter support of both these groups has been steadily declining especially in the face of North Korean missile tensions.¹⁴⁶

7. The Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry (METI) and Private Businesses

METI is a supporter of missile defense if it believes there can be net benefits gained by Japanese industry. Defense industry players such as Mitsubishi Heavy Industries (the main missile defense contractor), Kawasaki Heavy Industries, Ishikawajima-Harima Heavy Industries, Fujitsu, Toshiba and Nissan Motors stand to gain from cooperation with the United States.¹⁴⁷ In addition, Japan’s space industry gains from more attention given to reconnaissance satellites and spin-off technology from missile defense may give it an edge in increasing its poor competitiveness with regards to commercial payload launch service.¹⁴⁸ So far, Mitsubishi Heavy Industries seems to enjoy the biggest gains from missile defense cooperation, being granted over \$1 billion in PAC-3 contracts and a license for indigenous PAC-3 production.¹⁴⁹ The pattern of Japanese purchasing of U.S. systems until they develop the capability to produce their own versions is one continued in SM-3 cooperation as well.

8. The Public and the Media

The Japanese public has increased awareness of ballistic missile defense, due largely in part to the Taepodong missile launch in 1998 and the media’s interest in covering the various North Korean issues along with missile defense since then. The *Yomiuri Shimbun*, the *Sankei Shimbun*, and the *Nihon Keizai Shimbun* are traditional supporters of Japanese military programs including missile defense. The *Yomiuri Shimbun* is the largest daily newspaper in circulation. These three newspapers emphasize the security a missile defense grants to Japan. The *Asahi Shimbun* tends to take a more liberal stance in opposition to the government in general, especially missile defense.

¹⁴⁶ Swaine et. al, 60.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 60-61.

¹⁴⁸ Berner, 32.

¹⁴⁹ Sekigawa Eiichiro, “Arms and Japan” *Aviation Week & Space Technology* Vol. 161, no 22, New York (Dec 6 2004): 30.

Therefore the *Asahi Shimbun* tends to emphasize the negative impact missile defense could have on Japan's relations with its neighbors.¹⁵⁰ There has yet to be a comprehensive public debate on missile defense, although public opinion seems to be divided between those concerned about Chinese and North Korean missile threats on one hand and those concerned about worsening relations due to a Japanese missile defense on the other.

9. Alliance Maintenance

Before Koizumi's concerted efforts to embrace cooperation with the United States on missile defense, it was seen as an issue that could either raise tensions or bring closer ties. Over the past several years, missile defense has become another facet of Koizumi's foreign policy representing the very close relationship between the two countries. For at least the duration of the Bush administration, missile defense appears to be an item to be utilized as alliance maintenance. Even had the DPJ gained a majority coalition, the notion of alliance maintenance would have allowed the DPJ more flexibility in its policy regarding possible opposition if it decided to pursue missile defense. Due to strong LDP success, Koizumi will have the continued opportunity to closely cooperate with the United States on missile defense, which has the added benefit of giving Japan leverage in American base realignment, especially in Okinawa as Japan is seen as doing "its fair share." The Japanese fear of being too dependent on United States intelligence relating to missile threats is reflected in the launching of reconnaissance satellites to provide their own intelligence on North Korea and the region. A source of tension that still needs to be resolved is the nature of collective defense and the possibility of a Japanese system being employed to defend areas other than Japan. This will be discussed more under Legal Considerations below.

10. Financial Constraints

The debate over cost consideration is significant as Japan still has yet to recover from its economic decline. The main issues are its overall affordability, its impact on other military programs, and its effect on individual armed service budgets.¹⁵¹ The large price tag associated with missile defense has become more acceptable to the Diet and

¹⁵⁰ Cronin, "Japan-U.S. Cooperation on Ballistic Missile Defense: Issues and Prospects," 20-21.

¹⁵¹ Swaine et. al, 66.

Ministry of Finance after growing North Korean missile capabilities and nuclear weapons aspirations. The JDA is an advocate of missile defense, but begrudges the Ministry of Finance the heavy cuts it has had to undergo in other areas in order to attain funding for it, which is estimated to be around \$10 billion to reach full implementation. These cuts are in addition to continual year-after-year one percent cuts in the defense budget by the Ministry of Finance.¹⁵² In attempts to ease fears of costly dependence on United States systems, a compromise was reached where initial procurements would be bought from the United States until domestic capability for production is reached. As to be expected, those in favor of missile defense focus on its need while those opposed focus on its cost.

11. Legal Considerations

Four main legal considerations impact the early debate on missile defense after the decision was made to participate in joint research, namely a constitutional limitation against collective self-defense, a legislative resolution prohibiting the military use of space, laws prohibiting the export of weapons and military technology, and the provisions of the ABM Treaty.¹⁵³

The first consideration represents the issue which needs the most resolution. Article 9 of the Constitution has been interpreted to prohibit collective defense on the part of Japan. The integrative nature of a joint missile defense with the United States raises the question of whether or not Japan would use resources under its control to shoot down ballistic missiles targeted at other countries. So far, the answer has been a firm “no”, such as Koizumi’s statement on 18 March 2005 that “The purpose of our country’s missile defense is to intercept incoming missiles targeting Japan. We are not thinking of dealing with other missiles targeting our allies.”¹⁵⁴ A recent amendment to the SDF Law allows the Director General of the JDA the authority to shoot down any missile over Japanese airspace before or after a launch has been detected, although this would later

¹⁵² Highlights of the Budget for FY2005,” Ministry of Finance, 2005.

¹⁵³ Swaine et. al, 71.

¹⁵⁴ “Japan Would Not Use U.S.-Aided Missile Defense System to Protect Allies, Prime Minister Says,” Associated Press <<http://www.cndyorks.gn.apc.org/yspace/articles/bmd/japan50.htm>> accessed 28 August 2005.

have to be reported to the Diet.¹⁵⁵ Opponents of missile defense cite the inevitability of Japan violating its Constitution should the system be fully implemented, often pointing to a possible confrontation between the United States and China over Taiwan. Advocates either maintain Japan's ability to stay within legal limits or push for change in the legal framework itself. The trend of an increase in the defense roles and capabilities of the SDF over the past fifteen years due to re-interpretation of the Constitution and the passing of new legislation suggest this legal consideration as well as others will be resolved on the basis of "reality and necessity". According to a *Mainichi* poll of all candidates in the recent elections, 80% of all members of the lower house now support a revision of the Constitution. 92% of the LDP, 87% of the New Komeito and 69% of the DPJ all felt the Constitution should be amended while the JCP and the SDP members remained opposed. Furthermore, 75% of the LDP lower house members felt Japan should be able to participate in collective security while 50% of the DPJ and 94% of the New Komeito were opposed.¹⁵⁶ This means at least 58% of newly elected lower house members are now in favor of Japan participating in collective security.

The second issue is a 1969 resolution adopted by the Japanese Diet at the establishment of the National Space Development Agency which limited the use of space to "peaceful purposes".¹⁵⁷ While not a law, it has been interpreted to prohibit military use of space. While there has not been a formal abrogation of this resolution, the unanimous decision to build reconnaissance satellites following the 1998 North Korean Taepodong launch began a process where this legal consideration started to be pushed to the side. In 1999, the Navy Theater Wide program was determined not to be in violation of the peaceful use of space, setting the precedent for further action in similar area, even though the specific program itself was cancelled by the United States.¹⁵⁸ The actual deployment of satellites and continual efforts to do so combined with agreements to

¹⁵⁵ "Diet passes bill to shoot down ballistic missiles launched at Japan," *Mainichi*, 22 July 2005 <<http://mdn.mainichi-msn.co.jp/national/archive/news/2005/07/22/20050722p2a00m0na013000c.html>> accessed 28 August 2005.

¹⁵⁶ "Most Newly Elected Legislators in Favor of Revising Japan's Constitution," *Mainichi Online* 13 September 2005 <<http://mdn.mainichi-msn.co.jp/national/news/20050913p2a00m0na004000c.html>> accessed 13 September 2005.

¹⁵⁷ Tamama Tetsuo "Japanese Space Policy Revision and Future of National Security," Defense Research Center, 2002 <<http://www.drc-jpn.org/AR-6E/tamama-e02.htm>> accessed 24 August 2005.

¹⁵⁸ Cronin, "Japan-U.S. Cooperation on Ballistic Missile Defense: Issues and Prospects," 25.

participate in a missile defense system employing early warning satellites implies this legal consideration is largely taking a backseat to necessity.

Japan's Three Principles on Arms Exports adopted in 1967 states any export of arms from Japan would require METI approval and is not allowed to "communist countries, those under UN Security Council embargo, and those involved in or likely to be involved in international conflicts."¹⁵⁹ It has been interpreted to mean no sale of weapons, weapons parts, or underlying technology. A joint research venture between Japan and the United States on missile defense is founded on the basis of technology transfer so a re-interpretation would have to be made. Along with the release of the National Defense Program Outline in December 2004, Chief Cabinet Secretary Hosoda Hiroyuki announced the joint missile defense cooperation would be exempt from the three principles only with the United States.¹⁶⁰ While very specific in its language, it nonetheless represents another instance where the law has been stretched to fit the circumstances.

The last major legal issue, the ABM Treaty, became a moot point after the Bush administration announced its intent to withdraw on 14 December 2001, formally withdrawing on 13 June 2002 in accordance with the six month window timeframe.¹⁶¹ The Russian response was surprisingly mild, with Russian President Vladimir Putin saying it was a "mistake" but did not threaten the Russian Federation and cooperation on a variety of strategic issues would continue.¹⁶²

In summary, the main legal consideration still remaining is the notion of collective defense. As a Constitutional issue touching more than just missile defense, concrete debate can result in the amending of the Constitution, further reinterpretation or less likely, the prohibition of missile defense. Recent trends have shown the amendment

¹⁵⁹ "National Report on the Implementation of Programme of Action (PoA) to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects" Ministry of Foreign Affairs <<http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/disarmament/weapon/report0306.html>> accessed 28 August 2005.

¹⁶⁰ Hosoda Hiroyuki "Naikakukanbouchoukan danwa: Heisei 17 Nendoikou ni kakawaru bouei keikaku no taikou ni tsuite" 10 December 2004 <http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/tyokan/koizumi/2004/1210_danwa.html> accessed 28 August 2005.

¹⁶¹ Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) in Northeast Asia: An Annotated Chronology, 1990-2003.

¹⁶² "U.S. Quits ABM Treaty," CNN Online 14 December 2001 <<http://archives.cnn.com/2001/ALLPOLITICS/12/13/rec.bush.abm/>> accessed 28 August 2005.

of the Constitution is the most likely outcome. Legal considerations have served more to voice debate and state positions on the issue as they have largely been worked around in order to implement missile defense cooperation with the United States.

12. Technical feasibility and Architecture Issues

The skepticism over the feasibility of missile defense represents one of the larger obstacles for advocates. Even among those who recognize the existence of a ballistic missile threat from North Korea or China, there are some who view missile defense systems as a waste of resources and a problem which would be better addressed through diplomatic means.¹⁶³ The success of Patriot air defenses in Operation Iraqi Freedom has been enough to convince some, as evidenced by former DPJ president Kan Naoto's strong support for missile defense, although he was formerly a fierce opponent, after witnessing their use in Iraq. The clearing of this opposition led to easier clearing of missile defense proposals in the Diet.¹⁶⁴ His successor Okada Katsuya is not as strongly convinced, as evinced by the current vague stance held by the DPJ. Those in favor of missile defense tend to stress its need while those opposed stress its technical futility.

13. Industrial/Commercial Considerations

Those in favor of missile defense see an opportunity for synergy between METI, the JDA and defense industries which will result in a strengthening of Japan's defense industries, improving technology and acquisition, and the provision of benefits to the commercial sector. Those opposed cite high up-front costs necessary for investment, legal barriers, net technology drain and a diversion of funding from current contracts.¹⁶⁵ The legal barrier regarding arms export has been overcome due to the exception provided for missile defense with the United States and the problem of net technology drain has been addressed by allowing Japanese companies a significant role in the research, development and production of missile defense technology. JDA Director-General Ohno Yoshinori has stated "Licensed production would secure Japan's technological and production bases. The cost will be higher in the short-term, but when we think about the costs of inviting technicians from the United States for maintenance and repair, it would

¹⁶³ Cronin, "Japan-U.S. Cooperation on Ballistic Missile Defense: Issues and Prospects," 22-26.

¹⁶⁴ David Fouse, "Japan Gets Serious About Missile Defense: North Korean Crisis Pushes Debate," *Asia-Pacific Security Studies* Vol. 2, no. 4 (June 2003): 3-4.

¹⁶⁵ Swaine et. al, 77-78.

balance out in the long run” and Mitsubishi Heavy Industries licensed production of PAC-3 missiles would be beneficial.¹⁶⁶ Despite initial hesitance, it appears the defense industry is generally in favor of missile defense.

14. The China Factor

Those opposed to missile defense because of its negative effects on Japanese relations with China cite the potentially destabilizing nature of a missile defense which would necessitate an arms race in the region and send incorrect signals of Japanese militarism. They would also point to the lack of flexibility it would give their relations with China and the possible involvement in a conflict due to United States policy in the region. Lastly, they believe stable relations with China are conducive to business relations between the two countries. Advocates of missile defense feel the issue of China’s response is becoming less relevant as the more Beijing links Japanese missile defense with a threat to China’s nuclear deterrent, the more Japanese feel it is being targeted at them.¹⁶⁷ Advocates also tend to be nationalistic and view an oncoming struggle with China for future economic leadership of the Asian region as inevitable. Current policymakers seem to view China’s missiles as a threat to Japan as evidenced by stating it specifically in the National Defense Program Outline for 2005-2009.¹⁶⁸

15. The North Korea Factor

North Korea’s launching of a Taepodong missile in August 1998 and continual nuclear weapons development has probably contributed the most towards acceptance of a Japanese missile defense system. It has prompted support for joint research and development of the system and indigenous satellite monitoring systems. It also allows Japanese policymakers to clothe the issue in terms of a North Korean missile threat rather than confronting directly the issue of the Chinese missile threat, even though there are moves towards this direction. In the public’s eye, it is North Korea that embodies the danger from which a missile defense system needs to shield Japan. As long as six-party talks remain more or less at an impasse, advocates of missile defense can always cite

¹⁶⁶ “Japan, U.S. agree on licensed production of PAC-3 missiles in Japan” Kyodo News 19 July 2005 <http://mae.pennnet.com/News/Display_News_Story.cfm?Section=WireNews&SubSection=HOME&NewsID=122356> accessed 28 August 2005.

¹⁶⁷ Swaine et. al, 63-83.

¹⁶⁸ National Defense Program Outline, Japan Defense Agency, 2004.

North Korea as an urgent threat to push forward the debate in favor of continued cooperation with the United States.

As a whole, opposition to Japanese missile defense internally still remains on the basis of largely financial and legal constraints, technical feasibility and industrial considerations and the issue of China's response. Financial constraints are mitigated by joint projects with the United States while industrial considerations are used to shape which areas Japan will cooperate in. As the threat environment in the region increases, Japan will most likely continue its trend of gradually bending and changing rules to suit its needs with public opinion, with concern over developments in North Korea providing some justification.

G. TRENDS AND SUMMARY

The debate over missile defense and cooperation with the United States mirrors similar trends in other security issues, such as the expansion of SDF defense roles and capabilities. There has been a steady advance towards participation and closer ties with the United States on this issue with large changes prompted by outside events. For missile defense, the primary mover has always been the perceptions of a North Korean missile threat combined with Prime Minister Koizumi's foreign policy of alignment with Washington in the pursuit of close relations. While significant legal questions are still raised by Japanese participation in missile defense, many of these questions have either been sidestepped or dealt with directly in favor of continued cooperation. Devoid of any changes in government, the likely trend for the future will be increased Japanese participation in the United States missile defense system in Northeast Asia.

V. REGIONAL PERCEPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS OF JAPANESE TMD

A. SOUTH KOREA

South Korea opted out of participating in TMD in 1999. Seoul assented to the deployment of PAC-2 and PAC-3 missile batteries to strategic locations within South Korea but does not want to participate in TMD architecture for several reasons.¹⁶⁹ Key to South Korean concerns is the fear TMD will provoke an arms race with North Korea and hurt chances of a peaceful reunification and “soft landing” in the near future. TMD is viewed as an issue which will only slow the reduction of tensions on the Korean peninsula. Seoul must also take into consideration Beijing’s objections to TMD and future relations with China. At the most basic level, South Korea sees little need for TMD because even if the North Korean missile threat was completely neutralized, it would offer no help against the preponderance of artillery targeted against Seoul and other population areas.¹⁷⁰

Another factor in South Korea’s perceptions of a Japanese TMD is distrust of Japan itself. With national memory constantly dwelling on past Japanese militarism and colonization of Korea, this distrust is not altogether unexpected. Recognition of Japanese anxiety created by North Korea’s actions leads some to speculate Japan may seek to acquire nuclear weapons of its own.¹⁷¹ Combined with a missile defense, it would give Japan defense, double deterrence from Japanese and United States nuclear weapons, and a strike capability which would be very destabilizing in the region. At the very least, it would give Japan more leverage in contentious issues like ownership of the Takeshima/Tokdo islands. Further still, there are those in South Korea who hope to see a unified Korea which inherits North Korean nuclear weapons and ballistic missile

¹⁶⁹ Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) in Northeast Asia: An Annotated Chronology, 1990-2003.

¹⁷⁰ Jae Ho Chung, “South Korea Between Eagle and Dragon: Perceptual Ambivalence and Strategic Dilemma,” *Asian Survey* Vol. 41, no. 5 (Sep. – Oct., 2001): 777-780, 794.

¹⁷¹ Michael H. Armacost, “Japan: Tilting Closer to Washington,” 90-91.

capability.¹⁷² A TMD would do much to neutralize any newfound benefit gained in this manner.

South Korea's response to a fully developed Japanese TMD will most likely be one of denunciation, resigned acceptance, or tacit approval. South Korean response hinges mainly on how it would affect the North Korean reunification dialogues and the security situation. Should TMD be a major impediment to dialogue, South Korea would criticize the United States and Japanese decision. However, since South Korean security depends on the United States, any such criticism would be muted unless counterbalanced by strong influence from China's position. The more hostilities seem likely, the more support for TMD will develop within South Korea but it is unlikely to be manifested in strong public statements.¹⁷³

B. CHINA

China's position on TMD is strong, open opposition while quietly researching its own missile defense capabilities. The basis for China's sentiment is multi-fold. First, Chinese analysts publicly cite the destabilizing nature of a missile defense because it would neutralize China's second strike capability, subjecting them to "nuclear blackmail" and causing an unnecessary arms race focused on Chinese modernization to their missile program. A second concern is the prospects of China's military modernization, which includes a concerted drive towards missile enhancement, the change from liquid to solid rocket fuel for reduced launch time, more precise guidance systems, mobile launch platforms and missile defense countermeasures that began in the 1980s. China views its ballistic missile program as an integral part of all levels of military force rather than solely the delivery of WMD. Should these efforts be neutralized or abandoned, it would represent a significant lost opportunity cost. Furthermore, the more measures China has to undergo to make a TMD-resistant missile force, the more its actions will alarm its neighbors.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷² Robyn Lim, "The US-Japan Alliance in the Korean Crucible," *American Asian Review* Vol. 21, no. 3 (Fall 2003): 23.

¹⁷³ Michael J. Green and Toby F. Dalton, "Asian Reactions to U.S. Missile Defense," *NBR Analysis*, National Bureau of Asian Research, Vol. 11, no. 3 (November 2000): 21-23.

¹⁷⁴ Paul H. B. Godwin "Potential Chinese Responses to US Ballistic Missile Defense," *China and Missile Defense: Managing U.S.-PRC Strategic Relations*, Stimson Center, 2002, 61-68.

As such, China could pursue an option of “small but modern” nuclear force which would depend upon a limited number of nuclear missiles with the capability to outsmart or outperform any missile defense system employed in the region. This would represent a continuation of China’s “uncertainty principle” where a lack of knowledge about the survivability of China’s missile forces would deter actions to destroy them or at the very least offer some deterrence to American or Japanese forces from intervening in military action where the threat and costs of Chinese missile retaliation would be high. This would include the use of Multiple Re-entry Vehicles (MRV’s), Multiple Independently Targetable Re-entry Vehicles (MIRV’s), decoys, chaff or detection-resistant material and design meant to overcome ballistic missile defense systems. It would also include the use of mobile, non-silo launch vehicles, camouflage and other techniques designed to increase their survivability.¹⁷⁵

“Assured minimum deterrence” would require not only a modernization and increase in the effectiveness of existing ballistic missiles but also an increase in their number to overcome a layered missile defense system. This method would operate not only on the “uncertainty principle”, but have the added dimension of quantity to increase its deterrence value. In order to be effective, China would have to acknowledge possession of more than a small quantity of missiles and run the risk of being perceived as provoking an arms race by the rest of Asia.¹⁷⁶

Yet another strategy would be “limited nuclear deterrence” and would represent a shift from a minimal number of nuclear missiles to discourage a nuclear strike towards a larger, more comprehensive ability to wage nuclear war. While still not an attempt to match a United States nuclear force level, it would be a step beyond assured minimum deterrence due to the sheer number of missiles required. It would certainly raise warning flags all across the region as a sign of Chinese belligerency despite any Chinese arguments which would blame TMD. The expense in political capital as well as monetary would make this a costly option for Beijing.¹⁷⁷

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 65-66.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 66-67.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 67-68.

While Beijing may have concerns over TMD reducing Chinese leverage against possible United States action in Asia, there are also fears of it contributing to a militarization of Japan. The common reference to TMD being a shield against other countries' nuclear weapons have led many analysts to point to the possibility of Japan developing the "sword" of nuclear weapons for themselves. Despite being in compliance with the IAEA's safeguard standards and signatories of the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Japan has the ability to quickly develop nuclear weapons should it choose to do so. Therefore Chinese analysts criticize Japanese participation in TMD as a two-fold approach to gain missile technology to be employed in nuclear weapons while at the same time neutralizing the nuclear deterrents of its neighbors.¹⁷⁸ Regardless of how urgent Beijing feels this danger is or how realistic, it offers a convenient excuse for the modernization of its missile force much in the same way North Korea's actions provides a convenient excuse for Japan to implement missile defense.

China will try to capitalize on Washington and Tokyo's efforts to implement a TMD in Northeast Asia, saying justification based on North Korean action is only an excuse to develop a capability that threatens China's nuclear deterrent. Beijing will continue to use TMD technology transfers to Taiwan from Washington as one justification for increasing its missile modernization efforts. Should Taiwan gain an ability to neutralize the Chinese ballistic missile capability or gain too much confidence from a TMD program, China would feel endangered in regards to reunification efforts.¹⁷⁹ TMD will lead to a straining of relationships between Japan and China, although this will most likely be in the context of already existing competition for influence in Asia. Consequently, China will attempt to use this issue to woo countries like South Korea away from ambivalent cooperation with Japan and the United States.

C. TAIWAN

Taiwan is a strong supporter of TMD in Northeast Asia because Taipei can use it to its advantage despite Washington's doctrine of strategic ambiguity. It welcomes any

¹⁷⁸ Urayama Kori "Chinese Perspectives on Theater Missile Defense: Policy Implications for Japan," *Asian Survey* Vol. 40, no. 4 (Jul. – Aug. 2000): 602-603.

¹⁷⁹ David M. Finkelstein, "National Missile Defense and China's Current Security Perceptions," *China and Missile Defense: Managing U.S.-PRC Strategic Relations*, Stimson Center, 2002, 47-51.

development which would enhance the amount of military aid in the event of an attempt to forcefully reunite the island with the mainland. As much as possible, it wishes to create the perception of increased American support for Taiwan in the eyes of Beijing in hopes of deterring any such contingency.

Taiwan has repeatedly requested the purchase of PAC-3 and Aegis cruisers in the past although Washington has delayed its consideration of sales. Currently, the plan is to allow Taiwan the purchase of six batteries of PAC-3 missiles, with four launchers per battery and 16 interceptors per launcher by the year 2019 despite Taiwan's requests for a faster plan of implementation.¹⁸⁰ Taiwan's main interest is lower tier terminal phase defense capability in the form of the PAC-3 with some midcourse phase defense capabilities in the form of the Aegis SM-3 due to the short and medium range missiles aimed at the island. The acquisition of missile defense capabilities also serves as an opportunity for Taiwan to upgrade its C3I architecture, early warning and air defense capabilities. At the same time, there is concern that gaining too much missile defense capability would spur China into preemptive action in order to resolve the issue before Taiwan actually gains the ability to withstand a large attack from the mainland. Although perhaps an unrealistic hope, there are also those who see TMD as a way to reduce the concept of strategic ambiguity and increase the proximity between Washington and Taipei.¹⁸¹ A Japanese TMD does not necessarily mean it will be obligated to defend Taiwan although both proponents for and against TMD in Japan are highly aware of this possibility. As such, Taiwan will try to be involved in any BMD efforts in the region and could be seen as a constraint on Japanese defense policy.¹⁸²

D. NORTH KOREA

North Korea is obviously against the development of any BMD capability. North Korea's missile program serves several purposes including the preservation of Kim Jong Il's regime, a source of revenue in arms sales, and potential deterrent once its longer range missiles are operational and equipped with WMD. North Korean response to a

¹⁸⁰ "Taiwan plans to buy PAC-3 missile systems from U.S." Taiwan News
<<http://etaiwannews.com/Taiwan/2004/03/04/1078365181.htm>> accessed 16 February 2005.

¹⁸¹ Darren Rice, "Missile Defense for Taiwan: Implications for U.S. Security Interests in East Asia." M.A. thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, 2003, 43-47.

¹⁸² Michael J. Green and Toby F. Dalton, "Asian Reactions to U.S. Missile Defense," 27-29.

TMD would entail a costly arms race, a sell-out option where the United States would buy up North Korea's missile program, or the pursuit of alternate delivery systems.¹⁸³ Most likely Pyongyang will seek alternate delivery systems while continuing its rhetoric that the United States is merely trying to nullify North Korea's deterrent and attempt regime change.

Despite the fact TMD gained impetus in Northeast Asia as a direct result of North Korea's weapons programs, North Korea will attempt to use it to bolster its bargaining position vis-à-vis South Korea and China. Pyongyang echoes similar sentiments by China regarding Japan's possible militarism and pursuit of nuclear weapons in addition to missile defense. It is highly unlikely North Korea could maintain an arms race with the United States and Japan so a capable TMD could serve the purpose of neutralizing Pyongyang's attempts at hostage diplomacy in northeast Asia.

E. RUSSIA

Russia's position towards TMD and NMD has traditionally been antagonistic, citing the dangers of abrogating the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM Treaty) as being dangerous to both United States and Russian security interests. However, after the Bush administration announced its withdrawal from the ABM Treaty, Moscow expressed disappointment yet stated it was not a threat to Russian security interests and cooperation regarding nonproliferation and arms reduction with the United States would continue.¹⁸⁴ Moscow seems to be concerned more with NMD rather than TMD and even then does not consider it capable of neutralizing Russia's nuclear capability. Interestingly enough, Russia has begun to advocate a European TMD and the NATO-Russia TMD Ad Hoc Working Group participated in its first exercise in Colorado Springs, Colorado in March 2004.¹⁸⁵ Russia seems poised to take advantage of any political leeway gained from opposition or support of TMD and modernization of missile and missile defense

¹⁸³ Michael D. Swaine and Loren H. Runyon, "Ballistic Missiles and Missile Defense in Asia," NBR Analysis, National Bureau of Asian Research, Vol. 13, no. 3 (June 2002): 50-51.

¹⁸⁴ Sonja Pace, "US ABM Treaty Withdrawal Not Expected to Hurt Ties With Russia," Voice of America, 14 Dec 2001 <<http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/abmt/news/121401avoa.htm>> accessed 17 June 2005.

¹⁸⁵ "NATO-Russia Chronology of Activities," NATO Parliamentary Assembly, <<http://www.nato-pa.int/Default.asp?SHORTCUT=679>> accessed 17 June 2005.

technology as an outgrowth of cooperative missile defense efforts. Japan would not consider these actions posing any strategic threat to its security.

With specific regards to Japan possessing a missile defense, Russia has very little to be concerned about. The likelihood of Japan developing a missile defense capability strong enough to defend against a Russian attack is practically zero while it would have to go to extreme lengths to even come close to achieving parity with the Russian nuclear arsenal should it choose to develop such a capability. Russia stands to gain from cordial relations with Japan, provided they do not hinder relations with China, and apart from territorial disputes of the Kurile Islands, there is little contention between the two countries. All the same, Russia benefits most from a stable status quo where it is able to play one Asian country off the other. Consequently, it may choose to voice muted criticism if it deems TMD too destabilizing in the region.¹⁸⁶

F. UNITED STATES

The United States has a direct interest in the peace and security of the East Asian region. Regional stability promotes economic prosperity, strengthening ties between the United States and its trading partners. Economic prosperity encourages openness of countries' economic systems which in turn encourages political openness and the spread of freedom throughout the area. The spread of freedom and wealth drives opposition to authoritarianism, increased awareness of the responsibilities of governments to ensure basic human rights and in full circle, enhances peace and security in the East Asian region. To maintain this stability, the United States actively works in the region through its projection of economic, political and military presence to deter aggression and promote integration.

As the closest U.S. strategic ally in the East Asian region, the status of Japan's Self Defense Force has important implications for burden-sharing. As Japan continues its eventual progression towards a military capacity unconstrained by its past and consistent with its economic and political power, one of the possible policy options includes a ballistic missile defense against nuclear and other threats posed either by North Korea or China. The ballistic missile defense option is one advocated by the current Bush

¹⁸⁶ William C. Wohlforth, "Russia's Soft Balancing Act," *Strategic Asia 2003-2004: Fragility and Crisis*, Seattle: National Bureau of Asian Research, 2003, 173-177.

administration as part of a broader campaign of counter-proliferation and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons technology and delivery systems that pose a threat to the United States and its allies.

Any Japanese decision regarding a ballistic missile defense system will have important ramifications for the U.S. – Japan security relationship and the bilateral relationships of each country with other nations in the region. How their decision regarding missile defense fits into their legal framework and interpretation thereof will have increasing relevance as calls for constitutional revision continue to increase. In an atmosphere highlighted by the North Korean nuclear program and increasing Chinese power, especial attention must be paid to the changing security dynamics and the role of Japan in its partnership with the United States in the region.

The current Bush administration fully supports Japan's TMD cooperation. Utilizing synergy between the alliance management, Japanese concerns over North Korean belligerence, pushes for a more defense-related role and image by the JDA, and Japan's defense industry's interests, TMD is now seen as method of strengthening the ties between Tokyo and Washington rather than an item of contention. Implementation poses an excellent opportunity for increased integration of United States and Japan's military forces to allow a "force transformation" to a smaller and more capable Japanese Self Defense Force in accordance with the JDA's National Defense Program Guidelines. It also enables the maintenance of the U.S. interest in providing a security umbrella for Japan.

There is some concern over how the Chinese will react to a fully implemented missile defense system in the region. The powerful business lobby favors stability in the region and a furtherance of trade with China, some seeing missile defense as possibly jeopardizing the relationship. Others see missile defense as initiating an unnecessary arms race in the region and point to China's missile modernization efforts as justification of their fears. Detractors from this view counter that Chinese missile modernization

efforts have not correlated with the status of the missile defense debate in the United States.¹⁸⁷

The importance of the Chinese reaction is in tension with perception of a threat from North Korea and the extent to which China is viewed as an inevitable strategic competitor. Missile defense is seen as a way to weaken North Korea's bargaining position by removing much of its "hostage diplomacy" power. As the North Korean missile program is also a source of revenue, it is seen as a method to decrease the viability of the Kim Jong Il regime. Strategic competition with China is seen as the likely outcome in the future or even the present state by some advocates, even without the implementation of a missile defense. This is not to say holders of this view are indifferent to security-related tension with China; only that they tend to view it as an acceptable consequence. This does cause some problems for U.S.-South Korean relations, as the Seoul's view at many times regarding the approach towards the North Korean nuclear crisis finds more similarity with Beijing's than it does with Washington's.

G. TRENDS AND SUMMARY

Taking into consideration the gains and losses to be had from implementing a TMD, Japan should continue along its current path of joint research and development to aid United States efforts for a Northeast Asia TMD. North Korea is a strong opponent of a TMD, China has serious concerns about the neutralization of its limited deterrent, and South Korea is opposed to it on the grounds it would hurt relations with North Korea. The missile threat from North Korea has demonstrably been unable to be resolved through talks, promises and incentives. Should the current crisis be resolved, it is highly probable North Korea would pursue the same course of action after continual rewarding of "bad behavior." Moreover, North Korean actions in recent years have thoroughly convinced policy makers of Japanese vulnerability to North Korean aggression without a missile defense.

¹⁸⁷ Baker Spring, "Myths about Missile Defense and the Arms Race," Heritage Foundation no. 1385 13 July 2000 <<http://www.heritage.org/Research/MissileDefense/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&PageID=12387>> accessed 1 September 2005.

While China asserts a TMD is necessitating an arms race, it is naïve to believe Beijing's missile modernization efforts would not be occurring in the absence of a TMD system. Furthermore, conflict between China and Japan is likely in the future as both countries attempt to gain regional leadership, both politically and economically. Russia remains rather ambivalent towards a system, feeling no threat of a possible neutralization of its strategic nuclear force and has participated in joint studies of the issue. The United States remains a firm backer of TMD and sees it as a way to limit North Korean bargaining power. Beijing believes Washington is merely using North Korea as an excuse for TMD with China being the real target. Washington remains aware of Beijing's concerns and stresses the limited nature of its intent and target, which is not China. To ease Beijing's fears, there must be an open dialogue regarding missile defense policy between the two countries.

VI. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this thesis is to examine both the debate driving missile defense in Japan and the implications of implementation. The United States has a direct interest in this issue as it is the position of the current administration to back missile defense cooperation in East Asia. Furthermore, Japan is a staunch ally of the United States, not only in the region, but also as a global partner. This has important consequences for burden-sharing, alliance management, and regional policy.

The background of Japanese security decisions following the Second World War in general and the debates regarding ballistic missile defense specifically were studied to understand these consequences. A brief overview of the expansion of the roles and capabilities of the Japanese Self Defense Forces and Japanese-United States relations was undertaken to understand important trends necessary for establishing the context of the missile defense debate. Key actors, issues and events in the missile defense debate were then discussed to identify trends and their implications. Regional perceptions of a missile defense in the region with Japanese participation were analyzed to understand how they will affect the U.S.-Japan security relationship and U.S. interests in the area.

A. TRENDS

Three major inter-related trends reveal themselves over the course of Japanese post-Cold War Self Defense Force evolution, relations with the United States and the debate over missile defense. These include the willingness to relax legal considerations in the face of political necessity, the gradual expansion of the roles and capabilities of the Japanese Self Defense Forces, and the responsiveness of Japanese decision makers to external factors, including most noticeably the security relationship with the United States and the threat from North Korea.

The adoption of a full-scale TMD by Japan would be yet another step in the gradual process of expanding the legal and technical capabilities of the JSDF, especially in the last fifteen years. It brings Japan even closer to forcing a decision on constitutional revision the more it bends its legal framework to allow for changes in policy dealing largely with collective security issues. As seen over these years, nearly all changes in

policy have been moving away from a “peace constitution”. This represents a shift towards a more military-based security outlook in contrast to the traditional postwar doctrine of comprehensive security where diplomatic and economic power was also seen as tools to enhance Japanese security. The more steps taken in this direction, the more Japan’s neighbors fear the resurgence of a military Japan. However, it is unfair to expect Japan to accept a permanent official renunciation of its military. In light of recent legal developments, it would be more conducive for regional relations if Japan formally adopted a legal structure recognizing the status of its military, even if this means amending the Japanese constitution. This would demonstrate more respect for the rule of law than simply reinterpreting the framework to meet present needs.

The major legal dilemmas encountered by Japanese policy makers regarding its Self Defense Forces and capabilities have usually all been in response to external factors, notably the issue of alliance maintenance with the United States and the North Korean missile threat. Overall, there has been a steady advance towards participation and closer ties with the United States on this issue with large changes prompted by outside events, including U.S. disappointment with the Japanese responses to the First Gulf War and the first North Korean nuclear crisis, growing Chinese missile capabilities, and the 1998 Taepodong missile launch combined with the recent round of North Korean nuclear weapons programs. For missile defense, the primary mover has always been the perceptions of a North Korean missile threat combined with Prime Minister Koizumi’s foreign policy of alignment with Washington in the pursuit of close relations. Internally, support for missile defense has grown from synergy between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Prime Minister Koizumi’s support for the United States, popular support for a hard-line stance on North Korea, perceptions of North Korean threat, support by various defense industries, and support from the JDA due to the ability of missile defense to provide it with a more concrete image of serving in defense of the Japanese nation. While significant legal questions are still raised by Japanese participation in missile defense, many of these questions have either been sidestepped or dealt with directly in favor of continued cooperation.

Even should the technical merits of TMD prove lacking, Japan can still rely upon the deterrence offered by the United States massive nuclear deterrence, although this is

nowhere near as psychologically reassuring to decision makers or the Japanese public. In addition, Japanese pursuit of the option gives them leverage in host-nation support matters, especially basing support in Okinawa, a long-time contentious issue. As long as the North Korean threat and alliance maintenance with the United States remain important in the eyes of policy makers, missile defense will proceed forward.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UNITED STATES POLICY

1. Possible Policy Options

As the full implementation of a theater missile defense system appears to be a matter of time rather than political will on the part of Japan, there are several broad policy options the United States can pursue. These include an abandonment of missile defense, a very aggressive pursuit of missile defense, or a more balanced and limited approach towards missile defense capability in East Asia.

a. Abandonment of Missile Defense Efforts in the Region

The first policy option is for the United States to reverse its position on theater missile defense. Should Taiwan or Japan wish to continue their pursuit of a ballistic missile defense system, they would have to do so independently of the United States. If any missile defense system remains, it would be purely of a tactical nature designed to protect American troops rather than defend large areas against missile attacks.

b. Aggressive Pursuit of Missile Defense in the Region

The second policy option is for the United States to aggressively pursue theater missile defense cooperation in the region as part of a broader continuation of a hard stance against North Korea and containment of China. Weakening of relations between China and the United States from this action would be acceptable as part of a larger strategic stance.

c. Balanced and Limited Pursuit of Missile Defense in the Region

The third policy option is for the United States to continue its pursuit of a theater missile defense capability to deter North Korean and Chinese missile threats while still trying to foster closer relations with the Chinese. The United States and its allies would prepare against military action in the region by either North Korea or China yet still promote economic and political ties with China. A level of open dialogue between

China and the United States on the issue of missile defense to ensure either side does not pose a significant threat to the other.

2. Recommended Course of Action

The United States should pursue the third policy option of promoting defense cooperation while pursuing amicable relations with China. The risks of an unmitigated missile attack against United States personnel and their families stationed overseas as well as the fate of host nations require the United States to do its best to deter such attacks and reduce their impact should they occur. The first policy option would deny the United States the ability to protect these individuals on any large-scale basis. Furthermore, the likelihood of developing more workable systems is sharply reduced if the emphasis on joint cooperation, research and development is removed. Such a move would result in budget cuts and the technology would suffer. In effect, even limited missile defense efforts on the tactical level would be greatly hindered.

Politically, it would remove a strong playing card by the United States in negotiations with North Korea. A missile defense system is necessary to counter the aggressive actions of North Korea, which are at odds with the desire of the United States and the other nations in the region for regional stability and economic prosperity on the international level. Continually giving in to North Korean demands because there is no other option is merely rewarding bad behavior. Giving up the option of missile defense after taking many steps to push it through would indicate a wavering stance on policy and could hurt negotiating rather than help it. A theater missile defense would serve to strengthen regional allies against acts of aggression through enhanced defense rather than offensive arms buildup. The interests of the United States are best served through deterring threats to stability while encouraging cooperation, stability and economic ties between countries of the region.

However, the third policy option is more desirable than the second. Theater missile defense is not predicated on a notion of hostility and can be pursued in conjunction with amicable relations. Essential to this strategy is the emphasis on the limited nature of a missile defense capability. Pursuing too strong a capability would justify Chinese fears of their nuclear deterrent being neutralized and could possibly result in a destabilizing arms race in the region. To assuage Chinese fears, there must be a level

of open dialogue regarding the strength of missile defense and its capacity. In a similar manner to China's nuclear deterrent operating on an "uncertainty principle", a country's missile defense capabilities have an element of uncertainty of effectiveness based on incomplete information. A country would be hesitant to attack another if the status of the defending country's nuclear survivability based on arsenal size and technology was unknown. By the same token, a country would be hesitant to attack another if the general level of the defending country's missile defense was known, but not in detail. Therefore a balance must be struck between assuring the Chinese their limited nuclear deterrence is not neutralized, while maintaining a level of secrecy necessary for the uncertainty principle to work. Much of this uncertainty is directed not at the Chinese themselves, but at other countries or actors who would use the information to their advantage. Excessive openness would result in merely setting a bar for other nations to work towards and overcome. A primary method of achieving this beneficial uncertainty is sharing general information on the strategic level while being open on the tactical and deployment level of missile defense in East Asia. For example, a movement of U.S. AEGIS cruisers equipped with missile defense capacity now has the added dimension of not only an increased combat presence, but an increased missile defense presence as well. When moving through locations closer to Chinese missile sites, they would represent a heightened threat to the Chinese nuclear deterrent in addition to regular combat capability. Consequently, openness between the United States military and the Chinese military is essential to mitigate Chinese concerns, as perception dictates policy rather than reality.

To serve the interests of the United States, Washington should pursue a balanced missile defense plan in East Asia. This promotes increasing defense cooperation with Japan, fostering stronger ties between the two nations. As one of the United States' staunchest allies, Japan is a strong partner in a mutually beneficial relationship. It also provides the prospect of safety for military personnel and their families overseas in the event of a missile attack, something which is only available on a limited level for only military personnel. It gives the United States a strong bargaining position with North Korea and discourages proliferation. While the Chinese reaction must be considered, it

can be calmed through open discussion of missile defense and military-to-military contact between China and the United States.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- “2ND LD: Japan extends SDF mission to Iraq for 1 year.” *Kyodo News*
<<http://asia.news.yahoo.com/041209/kyodo/d86s1bsg0.html>> [12 Dec 2004].
- “500 to 700 Ground Troops to be Sent to Iraq.” *Japan Times Online*. <<http://www.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/getarticle.pl5?nn20031209a1.htm>> [12 Dec 2004].
- “About APEC.” Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation.
<http://www.apec.org/apec/about_apec.html> [23 Mar 2005].
- Akaha, Tsuneo. “Japan’s Comprehensive Security Policy: A New East Asian Environment.” *Asian Survey* 31, No. 4 (Apr, 1991): 324-340.
- Armacost, Michael H. “Japan: Tilting Closer to Washington.” *Strategic Asia 2003-2004: Fragility and Crisis*. Seattle: National Bureau of Asian Research, 2003: 81-107.
- Armacost, Michael H. and Kenneth B. Pyle. “Japan and the Engagement of China: Challenges for U.S. Policy Coordination.” NBR Analysis Vol 12, no. 5 (December 2001).
- Asahi Shimbun* poll 26 Aug 2005.
- ASEAN Regional Forum.” ASEAN <<http://www.aseansec.org/arf.htm>> [21 Mar 2005].
- Asia Pacific Security Outlook 2004*. ed. Charles E. Morrison, Asia Pacific Agenda Project, Tokyo: Japan Center for International Exchange, 2004.
- Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) in Northeast Asia: An Annotated Chronology, 1990-2003*. East Asia Nonproliferation Project, Center for Nonproliferation Studies, March 2003.
- Beasley, W. G. *The Rise of Modern Japan*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1995.
- Berger, Thomas. “Japan’s International Relations: The Political and Security Dimensions.” *The International Relations of Northeast Asia*. ed. by Samuel S. Kim, Oxford: Rowman, 2004: 135-169.
- Berner, Steven. “Japan’s Space Program: A Fork in the Road?” RAND 2005.
- “BMD Basics.” Missile Defense Agency
<<http://www.mda.mil/mdalink/html/basics.html>> [16 Jun 2005].
- “Boue ni Juubun na Kakuho yuu.” *Yomiuri Online* <http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/features/hanto/200506/mi20050609_41.htm> [15 Jun 2005].

Chung, Jae Ho. "South Korea Between Eagle and Dragon: Perceptual Ambivalence and Strategic Dilemma," *Asian Survey* Vol. 41, no. 5 (Sep. – Oct., 2001): 777-796.

Constitution of Japan

Cossa, Ralph A. and Brad Glosserman, "U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation: Has Japan Become the Great Britain of Asia?" *Issues & Insights* Vol. 5, no. 3 (March 2005), Pacific Forum CSIS.

Cronin, Patrick M., Paul Giarra and Michael J. Green, "The Alliance Implications of Theater Missile Defense." *The U.S.-Japan Alliance: Past, Present and Future*. ed. by Michael J. Green and Patrick M. Cronin, New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1999: 170-185.

Cronin, Richard P. "Japan-U.S. Cooperation on Ballistic Missile Defense: Issues and Prospects." CRS Report for Congress, 19 Mar 2002.

"Current Issues Surrounding UN Peace-keeping Operations and Japanese Perspective." MoFA Japan, Jan 1997 <<http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/pko/issues.html>> [16 Mar 2005].

"Diet passes bill to shoot down ballistic missiles launched at Japan." *Mainichi Online*. 22 Jul 2005 <<http://mdn.mainichi-msn.co.jp/national/archive/news/2005/07/22/20050722p2a00m0na013000c.html>> [28 Aug 2005].

Duke, Stephen E. "Japan's Constitution, prospects for change: impact on U.S. presence in Japan." M.A. thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, 2001.

"Election 2005." *Mainichi Online* 13 Sep 2005 <<http://mdn.mainichi-msn.co.jp/features/election2005/>> [13 Sep 2005].

Feickert, Andrew. "Missile survey: Ballistic and Cruise Missiles of Selected Foreign Countries." CRS Report for Congress, 26 Jul 2005.

Finkelstein, David M. "National Missile Defense and China's Current Security Perceptions." *China and Missile Defense: Managing U.S.-PRC Strategic Relations*. Stimson Center, 2002.

Fouse, David. "Japan Gets Serious About Missile Defense: North Korean Crisis Pushes Debate." *Asia-Pacific Security Studies* Vol. 2, no. 4 (June 2003).

Fouse, David. "Japan's FY 2005 National Defense Program Outline: New Concepts, Old Compromises." *Asia-Pacific Security Studies* Vol. 4, no. 3 (March 2005).

Fukuda, Yasuo. "Naikakukanbouchoukan danwa." 19 Dec 2003 <<http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/tyokan/koizumi/2003/1219danwa.html>> [26 Aug 2005].

- Fukushima, Akiko. "Japan's Emerging View of Security Multilateralism in Asia." Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, University of California: 1999.
- Funabashi, Yoichi. *Alliance Adrift*. New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press: 1999.
- Garrett, Major. *The Enduring Revolution*. New York: Crown Forum, 2005.
- Godwin, Paul H. B. "Potential Chinese Responses to US Ballistic Missile Defense." China and Missile Defense: Managing U.S.-PRC Strategic Relations, Stimson Center, 2002.
- Green, Michael J. and Toby F. Dalton. "Asian Reactions to U.S. Missile Defense," NBR Analysis, National Bureau of Asian Research, Vol. 11, no. 3 (November 2000).
- Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation*. U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee release <http://www.fas.org/news/japan/97092302_epo.html> [12 Dec 2004].
- Hahn, Bae-ho. "Korea-Japan Relations in the 1970s." Asian Survey 20, No. 11 (Nov., 1980): 1087-1097.
- Hayes, Louis D. Introduction to Japanese Politics. Armonk: East Gate, 2001.
- "Highlights of the Budget for FY2005," Japanese Ministry of Finance, 2005.
- Hildreth, Steven A. "Missile Defense: The Current Debate." CRS Report for Congress, 19 Jul 2005.
- Hosoda, Hiroyuki. "Naikakukanbouchoukan danwa: Heisei 17 Nendoikou ni kakawaru bouei keikaku no taikou ni tsuite." 10 Dec 2004
<<http://www.kantei.go.jp/jp/tyokan/koizumi/2004/1210danwa.html>> [28 Aug 2005].
- "International Peace Cooperation Activities." CAO. <<http://www.cao.go.jp/peace.pdf>> [10 Dec 2004].
- Ishizuka, Katsumi. "The Evolution of Japan's Policy towards UN Peace Operations." paper presented at the Fifteenth Annual Meeting for the Academic Council on the UN System (ACUNS), at Cascais, Portugal, 21-23 June 2002.
- "Japan Defense Agency - Japan Self-Defense Force." <www.globalsecurity.org> [13 Mar 05].
- "Japan Would Not Use U.S.-Aided Missile Defense System to Protect Allies, Prime Minister Says." *Associated Press*
<<http://www.cndyorks.gn.apc.org/yspace/articles/bmd/japan50.htm>> [28 Aug 2005].

- “Japan, U.S. agree on licensed production of PAC-3 missiles in Japan.” *Kyodo News* 19 Jul 2005
http://mae.pennnet.com/News/Display_News_Story.cfm?Section=WireNews&SubSection=HOME&NewsID=122356 [28 Aug 2005].
- “Japan’s Contributions to International Peace.” International Peace Cooperation Headquarters http://www.pko.go.jp/PKO_E/pref_e.html#5rules. [11 Dec 2004].
- Joint Statement of the U.S.-Japan Security Consultative Committee*. 19 February 2005.
- Kajimoto, Tetsushi “New Komeito backs LDP reforms, rules out DPJ.” *Japan Times Online* 20 Aug 2005 <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/getarticle.pl5?nn20050820a4.htm> [28 Aug 2005].
- Kan, Shirley A. “Taiwan: Major U.S. Arms Sales Since 1990.” CRS Report for Congress, 5 Jul 2005.
- “Koizumi calls election for Sept. 11.” *Japan Times Online*. 9 Aug 2005
<http://www.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/getarticle.pl5?nn20050809a1.htm> [26 Aug 2005].
- “LDP, Komeito Renew Coalition Accord.” *Mainichi Online*. 13 Sep 2005
<http://mdn.mainichi-msn.co.jp/features/election2005/news/20050912p2a00m0na046000c.html> [13 Sep 2005].
- Lim, Robyn. “The US-Japan Alliance in the Korean Crucible.” *American Asian Review* Vol. 21, no. 3 (Fall 2003): 1-27.
- “Lockheed Martin Receives \$532 Million Production Contract.” Press Release Lockheed Martin <http://www.lockheedmartin.com/wms/findPage.do?dsp=fec&ci=16336&rsbci=0&fti=112&ti=0&sc=400> [16 Jun 2005].
- Machimura, Nobutaka. “Japan's Global Strategy and the Japan-US Global Partnership on the 60th Anniversary of the End of World War II.” New York, 29 Apr 2005.
- Mainichi Shimbun* poll 26 Aug 2005.
- Masaki, Hisane. “US eye on Japan’s polls.” *Asia Times Online* 27 Aug 2005
<http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Japan/GH27Dh02.html> [27 Aug 2005].
- McCargo, Duncan. *Contemporary Japan*. 2nd ed. New York: Palgrave, 2004.
- Medeiros, Evan S. “Ballistic Missile Defense and Northeast Asian Security: Views from Washington, Beijing and Tokyo.” Stanley Foundation and Center for Nonproliferation Studies, Monterey Institute of International Studies, 2001.

- Midford, Paul "Japan's Response to Terror." *Asian Survey* 43, no. 2 (Mar/Apr 2003).
- "Missiles – North Korea Special Weapons." <www.globalsecurity.org> [15 Jun 2005].
- "Most Newly Elected Legislators in Favor of Revising Japan's Constitution." *Mainichi Online*. 13 Sep 2005 <<http://mdn.mainichi-msn.co.jp/national/news/20050913p2a00m0na004000c.html>> [13 Sep 2005].
- Mulgan, Aurelia George. "International Peacekeeping and Japan's Response to the Challenge of Collective Security." paper presented during RSPAS Seminar, Australian National University, 5 March 1996.
- Munakata, Naoko. "Whither East Asian Economic Integration?" Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies, Brookings Institution: 2002.
- Murata, Koji. "Japan." *Humanitarian Intervention: The Evolving Asian Debate*, Japan Center for International Exchange, 2003.
- National Defense Program Guidelines: FY2005-*, Japan Defense Agency, 2004.
- "National Report on the Implementation of Programme of Action (PoA) to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects." Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs
<<http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/disarmament/weapon/report0306.html>> [28 Aug 2005].
- "NATO-Russia Chronology of Activities." NATO Parliamentary Assembly,
<<http://www.nato-pa.int/Default.asp?SHORTCUT=679>> [17 Jun 2005].
- Nihon Keizai* poll 25 Aug 2005.
- "NK: Right to peaceful nuke program." *CNN Online*. 13 September 2005
<<http://www.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/asiapcf/09/13/korea.nuclear/index.html>> [13 Sep 2005].
- Oberdorfer, Don. "North Korea: Six-Party Talks Continue." *Washington Post* transcript from online discussion, 28 Jul 2005 <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/discussion/2005/07/27/DI2005072701759.html>> [Aug 2005].
- Oberdorfer, Don. *The Two Koreas*. Indianapolis: Basic, 2001.
- Okada, Katsuya. "Toward Realization of Enlightened National Interest: Living Harmoniously with Asia and the World." 18 May 2005.
- "Okada says he will resign as DPJ head if his party loses in election." *Kyodo News*. 9 Aug 2005
<<http://home.kyodo.co.jp/modules/fstStory/index.php?storyid=197012>> [26 Aug 2005].

- Pace, Sonja. "US ABM Treaty Withdrawal Not Expected to Hurt Ties With Russia." *Voice of America*. 14 Dec 2001
<<http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/abmt/news/121401avoa.htm>> [17 Jun 2005].
- Przystup, James. "China, Japan and the United States." *The U.S.-Japan Alliance: Past, Present and Future*. ed. by Michael J. Green and Patrick M. Cronin, New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1999: 21-41.
- "Report: Nuke talks to be delayed," *CNN Online*. 28 Aug 2005
<<http://www.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/asiapcf/08/28/nkorea.talks.ap/index.html>> [28 Aug 2005].
- Rice, Darren. "Missile Defense for Taiwan: Implications for U.S. Security Interests in East Asia." M.A. thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, 2003.
- "Rockets Carrying Spy Satellites Destroyed." Mainichi Interactive
<<http://www12.mainichi.co.jp/news/mdn/search-news/932447/north20korea20missile-0-4.html>> [15 Jun 2005].
- "S. Korea: Pyongyang may compromise." *CNN Online*. 22 Aug 2005
<<http://www.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/asiapcf/08/21/us.korea.nuclear.ap/index.html>> [28 Aug 2005].
- Sekigawa, Eiichiro. "Arms and Japan." *Aviation Week & Space Technology* Vol. 161, no 22, New York (Dec 6 2004): 30.
- Shu, Robert "Japan's strategic future: coalition operations." M.A. thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, 2004.
- Simon, Sheldon. "Whither Security Regionalism?" *Strategic Asia 2003-2004: Fragility and Crisis*. Seattle: National Bureau of Asian Research, 2003.
- Sorimachi, Katsuo. "Sorimachi Speaks." *Tokyo Legal Mind* <http://www.lec-jp.com/speaks/info_011.html> [12 Dec 2004].
- Spring, Baker. "Myths about Missile Defense and the Arms Race." Heritage Foundation
<<http://www.heritage.org/Research/MissileDefense/loader.cfm?url=/commonspot/security/getfile.cfm&PageID=12387>> [1 Sep 2005].
- Stockwin, J. A. A. *Governing Japan*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- Swaine, Michael D. and Loren H. Runyon. "Ballistic Missiles and Missile Defense in Asia." *NBR Analysis* Vol. 13, no. 3 (Jun 2002).
- Swaine, Michael D., Rachel Swanger, and Kawakami Takashi. "Japan and Ballistic Missile Defense." RAND Corporation, 2001.

- “Taiwan plans to buy PAC-3 missile systems from U.S.” *Taiwan News*.
<<http://etaiwannews.com/Taiwan/2004/03/04/1078365181.htm>> [16 Feb 2005].
- Tamama, Tetsuo. “Japanese Space Policy Revision and Future of National Security.”
Defense Research Center, 2002 <<http://www.drc-jpn.org/AR-6E/tamama-e02.htm>> [24 Aug 2005].
- “Theater Missile Systems – China Nuclear Forces,” *Federation of American Scientists*.
<<http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/china/theater/index.html>> [15 Jun 2005].
- “Timeline: N. Korea Nuclear Dispute.” *CNN Online*.
<<http://www.cnn.com/2005/WORLD/asiapcf/02/10/nkorea.timeline/index.html>>
[5 June 2005].
- “Type 092 (Xia Class) Ballistic Missile Nuclear Submarine.”
<<http://www.sinodefence.com/navy/sub/092.asp>> [15 Jun 2005].
- “U.S. Quits ABM Treaty.” *CNN Online*. 14 Dec 2001
<<http://archives.cnn.com/2001/ALLPOLITICS/12/13/rec.bush.abm/>> [28 Aug 2005].
- “UN Peacekeeping Operations.” Ministry of Foreign Affairs Japan.
<<http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/un/pamph2000/pko.html>> [16 Mar 2005].
- Urayama, Kori. “Chinese Perspectives on Theater Missile Defense: Policy Implications
for Japan.” *Asian Survey* Vol. 40, no. 4 (Jul. – Aug. 2000): 599-621.
- “US agrees to Japan's licensed production of PAC-3 missiles: report.” *Associated French Press*. <<http://www.spacewar.com/2004/041123050145.ztipt049.html>> [16 Jun 2005].
- Wohlforth, William C. “Russia’s Soft Balancing Act.” *Strategic Asia 2003-2004: Fragility and Crisis* Seattle: National Bureau of Asian Research, 2003: 165-179.
- Yomiuri Shimbun* poll 26 Aug 2005.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

1. Defense Technical Information Center
Ft. Belvoir, Virginia
2. Dudley Knox Library
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
3. Professor Douglas Porch
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
4. Professor Edward A. Olsen
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
5. Professor H. Lyman Miller
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California
6. Yumiko Guajardo
United States Air Force Academy
Colorado Springs, Colorado